

EQUITY AND LAW

LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY,

18, LINCOLN'S INN FIELDS, LONDON, W.C.

ESTABLISHED 1844.

DIRECTORS.

Chairman—Cecil Henry Russell, Esq.

Harold Agnew, Esq.

C. E. Broughton, Esq.

Edmund Church, Esq.

Philip G. Collier, Esq.

Sir Kenneth B. Digby, G.C.B., K.C.

Charles Baker Dimond, Esq.

Sir Howard W. Elphinstone, Bart.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Grantham.

Richard L. Harrison, Esq.

L. W. North Hickley, Esq.

Deputy-Chairman—John Croft Deverell, Esq.

Archibald Herbert James, Esq.

The Rt. Hon. Lord Macnaghten, G.C.M.G.

William Maples, Esq.

Edward Moberly, Esq.

The Hon. Mr. Justice Phillimore.

George Thompson Powell, Esq.

Mark Lemon Romer, Esq., K.C.

The Hon. Charles Russell.

Richard Stephens Taylor, Esq.

H. P. Bowling Trevanion, Esq.

FUNDS EXCEED - - £4,594,000.

All classes of Life Assurance Granted. Reversions and Life Interests Purchased. Loans on Approved Securities entertained on Favourable Terms.

W. P. PHELPS, Actuary and Secretary.

THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND
WEEKLY REPORTER.

Vol. 53 of THE SOLICITORS' JOURNAL AND WEEKLY REPORTER commenced on October 31st, 1908. Annual Subscription, which must be paid in advance: £1 6s.; by post, £1 8s.; Foreign, £1 10s. 4d.

Cheques payable to H. Villers.

OFFICE: 27, CHANCERY LANE.

REDUCTION

IN "WITHOUT PROFITS"

Life Ass^{ce}. Rates

SEE THE NEW PROSPECTUS OF THE

NORTHERN ASS^{CE}. CO L^{TD}.

MOORGATE STREET, E.C.

LEGAL AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE
SOCIETY.

ESTABLISHED 1836.

FUNDS	-	-	-	-	£6,317,000
INCOME	-	-	-	-	£843,000
YEARLY BUSINESS	-	-	-	-	£3,000,705
BUSINESS IN FORCE	-	-	-	-	£23,680,000

THE PERFECTED SYSTEM of Life Assurance is peculiar to this Society and embraces every modern advantage.

PERFECTED MAXIMUM POLICIES.

WITHOUT PROFITS.

The Rates for these Whole Life Policies are very moderate.

Age	Premium	Age	Premium	Age	Premium
20	£1 7 8 %	30	£1 16 %	40	£2 10 %

£1,000 POLICY WITH BONUSES

According to last results.

Valuation at 2½ p.c. :- Hm. Table of Mortality.

Duration	10 yrs.	20 yrs.	30 yrs.	40 yrs.
Amount of Policy	£1,199	£1,438	£1,724	£2,067

Full information on application to

THE MANAGER, 10, FLEET STREET, LONDON.

The Solicitors' Journal

and Weekly Reporter.

LONDON, MAY 8, 1909.

* * The Editor cannot undertake to return rejected contributions, and copies should be kept of all articles sent by writers who are not on the regular staff of the JOURNAL.

All letters intended for publication must be authenticated by the name of the writer.

Contents.

CURRENT TOPICS	479	SOCIETIES	488
MISTAKES IN ACTS OF PARLIAMENT	482	LAW STUDENTS' JOURNAL	489
THE DEVOLUTION OF THE POWERS OF		LEGAL NEWS	490
TRUSTEES	482	COURT PAPERS	491
REVIEWS	483	WINDING-UP NOTICES	491
CORRESPONDENCE	483	CREDITORS' NOTICES	491
NEW ORDERS, &c.	487	BANKRUPTCY NOTICES	492

Cases Reported this Week.

Mangena v. Wright	485
P. v. P. (otherwise A.)	486
T., Re	487
Walker, Re, Ex parte Child	486

Current Topics.

The Retirement of Mr. Williamson.

MR. WILLIAMSON'S genial presence and his excellent judgment and long experience will be sorely missed at the institution in Chancery-lane, of which he has been, during the last forty-six years, so to speak, the Grand Vizier. He was a born secretary, and in other circumstances would have been a born diplomatist. A keen reader of character and full of tact, he knew how to adapt his communications to his men, and while giving them an unqualified refusal to a request, managed to do so word it as to avoid wounding the *amour propre* of his correspondents. In the speeches at the recent meeting stress was rightly laid on Mr. WILLIAMSON'S invariable courtesy; an easy quality to cultivate one might fancy, but in fact not at all times to be found flourishing amongst secretaries and their subordinates. He commenced life, we believe, as a solicitor at Hull, and was appointed secretary of the Law Society in 1863, in succession to Mr. ROBERT MAUGHAM, the first secretary. During the succeeding years of his office Mr. WILLIAMSON rendered remarkable services to the society, and, in particular, when the Council were moved to take up the opposition to the Land Transfer Act, which postponed the passing of that measure for so many years, his energy and power of organization were conspicuous. Every one will wish him, in the terms of the resolution passed last week, the enjoyment of many years of health and happiness.

The Proposed Doubled Stamp Duties.

THE CHANCELLOR of the Exchequer has spread his net wide in order to get in the revenue which is required to keep pace with Government extravagance—a phrase which we use in no party sense—but it would have been more consistent with the official policy as to cheapening the transfer of land if he had not touched the conveyance on sale duty. This duty has been the subject of various changes, but the present *ad valorem* duty of 10s. per cent. has remained unaltered since 1850, save that in 1865 the graduated scale below £25 was introduced. The present proposal is to increase it to 20s. per cent., and this will mean a very appreciable addition to the cost of the transfer of land. We are aware that when the Treasury have singled out a particular stamp for increase, it is almost impossible to frustrate their desires; but there ought to be some approach to agreement between official theory and practice. It will not be much good in future to talk about cheapening the transfer of small plots of land when the Government itself adds a further 10s. on every £100 which the purchaser—presumably the agricultural labourer—has to find. To turn to

another aspect of the matter, it should be remembered that during the palmy days of company formation the conveyance on sale duty brought into the revenue large sums which could never have been anticipated, and though this source is probably not so prolific as towards the close of the last century, it is still productive, and the increased duty will act as a distinct check to schemes of company formation. The legitimate increase of the stamp duties should be looked for in the increase of transactions, and not in the doubling of the duty itself. Amid the manifold complications of the Budget, it is perhaps useless to expect that this particular impost will be properly explained and discussed, but we hope that some opportunity will be found in Parliament to call attention to it, and to endeavour to restrict the conveyance duty to the present scale. The lease duty is to be subjected to the same doubling process, though why this should be we cannot say. The present scale, which is adjusted to the varying terms for which leases are granted, has been in operation since 1854.

The Proposed Intermediate Judges.

WE REFERRED last week to the letter over the signature "F. A. S." which appeared in the *Times* recently, advocating a new method of disposing of arrears in the King's Bench Division. We are glad to have the opportunity of printing elsewhere a letter from the same correspondent explaining the scheme more in detail. As we observed last week, there is much to be said in its favour, but just now, when the relations between the High Court and the county courts are under consideration, it is natural to speculate on how it would affect these two tribunals. If the county court had never been established on its present footing, or had been kept strictly to small work, the creation of a lower division of the High Court would have been a plausible mode of dealing with the less important business. But the county courts, with their extended jurisdiction, exist, and the proposed lower division of the High Court would, *ex hypothesi*, be engaged in dealing with actions of a nature suitable to the county court. We have suggested that it would be difficult to maintain a permanent separation between the lower division of the High Court and the county court. There may not be much in a name, but what would the new judges be called? They could not be "Mr. Justice" on £2,000 a year, and "His Honour" seems to be the only alternative. And the limit of jurisdiction would mean that costs in the lower division would be on the county court scale. The practical distinction between the lower division and the county court would be that the judge of the lower division would give his whole time to trying actions up to £100, and would not have to do the miscellaneous work of a county court judge. But in this respect he would, we imagine, be in the same position as the county court judge who has been assigned for the relief of the Metropolitan county courts. The scheme suggested by "F. A. S." merits careful consideration, but we still incline to the opinion that there is, under existing conditions, no room for the creation of an inferior tribunal—for such the proposed tribunal would be, although called a division of the High Court—between the ordinary jurisdiction of the High Court and the county court.

Recording the Capital Sentence.

THE LORD Chief Justice has introduced a Bill—the Child Murder (Record of Sentence of Death) Bill—which, as its title indicates, is intended to avoid the necessity for the court to pronounce sentence of death in certain cases where it is known that the capital penalty will not be inflicted. The Bill is, in fact, a proposal for a partial return to the system which was legalised for the Central Criminal Court by the Central Criminal Court Act, 1837 (1 Vict. c. 77). Section 3 of that statute gave the court a general power of recording, instead of pronouncing, sentence of death whenever the court was of opinion that, under the particular circumstances of the case, the prisoner was a fit and proper subject to be recommended for the Royal mercy. And a similar course could already before this statute be adopted in other courts by virtue of 6 & 7 Will. 4, c. 30, s. 2: see *R. v. Hogg* (2 Moo. & R. 380). In 1861, however, the law was altered, and the Offences Against the Person Act of that year (24 & 25 Vict.

c. 100), by section 2, required sentence of death to be pronounced upon every conviction for murder. It is singular that this retrograde step should have been taken, and Lord ALVERSTONE's Bill would go a little way to bringing the matter back to the position of the early part of the nineteenth century. But we imagine that it will not be accepted as meeting the grave objection to the present practice as to capital punishment in cases of infanticide. If public opinion is not yet ripe for the abolition of the death penalty altogether—and this is probably a question of time—there would be nothing but relief in the public mind if it was formally abolished as regards cases where there is no intention of its being executed. Lord ALVERSTONE's Bill is not the measure required to bring the law into conformity at once with humanity and with administrative practice.

Lord Gorell and the Commissionership of Assize.

THE MEMBERS of the South-Eastern Circuit were informed some days ago that Lord GORELL had been appointed a Commissioner of Assize and would take the place of Lord ALVERSTONE, C.J., on the South-Eastern Circuit. We hear now that there are difficulties with regard to this appointment, and that it has been withdrawn. It is well known that the patent appointing judges to take the assizes included the names of the sergeants practising on the respective circuits, who were thus able to sit as justices of assize if necessary, and that by 13 & 14 Vict. c. 25 Queen's Counsel, and barristers having patents of precedence, although not of the degree of the coat, were authorized to sit as judges of assize. The Supreme Court of Judicature Act, 1884, extended this qualification to all judges of county courts. Lord GORELL has retired from the bench, and the question arose whether he could still be considered as one of his Majesty's counsel learned in the law. A judge is, no doubt, disabled from acting as King's Counsel during the period in which he occupies a seat on the bench, but the patent appointing him King's Counsel remains in force, and in the event of his vacating his office as judge there appears to be nothing to prevent him from taking his seat within the bar. We are informed that the late Sir CHARLES BUTT, upon some suggestion that he might be required, though a Judge of the Probate and Admiralty Division, to go circuit, talked of resigning his office and resuming his practice in the Admiralty Division and the Commercial Courts. But the question has never been determined, and any informality in the appointment of a Commissioner of Assize, who acts as a Judge of Oyer and Terminer and gaol delivery, might possibly lead to proceedings on behalf of criminals upon whom he had passed sentence. Lord GORELL in these circumstances has resigned his appointment, and Mr. HORACE AVORY, K.C., has been appointed in his place. There is no doubt that Sir JOHN MELLOR, who retired from the bench in 1879, acted subsequently as special Commissioner of Assize on the Northern Circuit. His appointment was probably warranted by the fact that he was made a serjeant-at-law before taking his seat on the bench in 1861. It may be thought expedient to amend the Judicature Acts by some provision which may enable anyone who has filled a high judicial office to act as Commissioner of Assize.

Legislation as to Taking Oaths in Courts of Justice.

THE OBJECT of the Oaths Bill, brought in by Mr. GODFREY BARING and others, is explained by the memorandum appended to it, which states that by section 5 of the Oaths Act, 1888, it is open to a person to whom an oath is administered, if he so desires, to swear with uplifted hand in the form and manner in which an oath is usually administered in Scotland. Under this Act, however, judges, magistrates, coroners, and other persons do not consider themselves justified in suggesting this form of oath to the witness, jury, or deponent, and it is a question whether the oath ought to be so administered unless the witness voluntarily requests it to be done. Consequently, the old form of kissing the Book, to which there are many objections, still prevails. The Bill, therefore, provides that the officer shall administer the oath by uplifted hand, unless the person about to take the oath voluntarily objects to taking it in this form. Any legislator, in introducing a

remedial Act, ought surely to have regard to the unwillingness of most persons to bring themselves into notice by proclaiming their disagreement with what has hitherto been generally accepted by their fellow subjects. But a judge so accomplished and experienced as the late Sir EDWARD ALDERSON, in a letter in which he expresses his regret at having to commit persons to prison for refusing to take the oath, advocates the rather strange proposition that an Act should be passed registering all such persons as will choose to go before a public officer, say justice of the peace, or quarter sessions, and by testimony of their neighbours satisfying such officer or court of their conscientious scruple. Thereupon such persons should be registered as *non-jurors*, and when they come into court they should say that they have been so registered, a false statement to that effect being a misdemeanour. We cannot but regard this suggestion as wholly impractical. Many persons who have a *bond-fide* objection to the taking of an oath might think that it was possible that they might never be subpoenaed to give evidence, and would think that in the meantime they would act wisely in concealing their opinions from their neighbours. In any case they would think the attendance necessary to procure their registration as *non-jurors* a troublesome business, and be likely to neglect it.

The Career of Gambetta at the Paris Bar.

THE LETTERS of LEON GAMBETTA to members of his family, recently published, contain particulars of his struggle at the Paris bar which cannot fail to interest those who are commencing their professional career on this side of the channel. GAMBETTA, son of a small shopkeeper at Cahors, in the south of France, was born in 1838, and was placed on the list of advocates in Paris in 1861. He was a stranger in the great city, without connections, and dependent for his subsistence on a scanty allowance from his father. He had since the days of his boyhood lost the sight of his right eye; was subject to attacks of bronchitis; and was generally of a weakly constitution. His political opinions placed him in opposition to the Government of the Empire and to all those who had the control of official or legal patronage. But he looked upon the future with confidence. Being wholly without practice of his own, he became secretary, or gratuitous assistant, to three well-known advocates in succession, M. DE JOUY, M. LACHAUD, and M. CREMIEUX. These gentlemen, according to the usage in such cases, occasionally handed him one of their superfluous briefs. He tells his father that he has twice been engaged in correctional or police courts, and in the same year makes his debut in the assize court and is complimented on his success. But we hear nothing of his earnings, and in January, 1862, he is obliged to borrow five sous in order that he may get shaved before going into court. In the same year he appears in a civil cause in the Fifth Chamber of the Court of Appeal. He is disconcerted by the solemn silence of the court and the gravity of the judges; loses his case (which is, however, a bad one) and goes away angry with those who congratulated him. But his energy and good spirits never fail; he gains the confidence of his last "patron," M. CREMIEUX, and represents him in different provincial courts, remote from Paris. At the end of 1862, he is "suffocated with work," has a case every day, sometimes twice a day. But he is only "beginning to get fees." In the following year he is able, having changed his lodgings, to buy books and furniture, but in 1865 he is so far embarrassed that he has to obtain assistance from his father. He afterwards makes a resolution that he will appear no more in court without prepayment. In 1867 he has again to apply to his father. He has been disabled by a serious illness, it has been necessary to remove his right eye and the charge for the artificial eye was 900 francs. Politics now absorb his attention; he is engaged for the defence in political prosecutions, and in 1869 is returned as a member of the Chamber of Deputies. It is unnecessary to follow his political career, which was one of meteor-like brilliancy, and was only brought to an end by his death at the age of forty-four. The fact remains that, in spite of his extraordinary gifts—eloquence, energy, perseverance, and all that goes to the making of a successful advocate—he was scarcely able, after nine years' experience, to derive a maintenance from the Parisian courts. The ways of French barristers seem to be hard.

The "Condition" in the County Court Report.

IN COMMENTING recently on the report of the County Court Committee, we call attention to the singular reasoning involved in the condition imposed on allowing greater facilities for bringing actions by consent in the county court. The condition is that, concurrently, there shall be a reform of the arrangements for conducting the provincial business of the High Court. Now each of these proposals may be accepted as good in itself. If the parties are willing to accept the jurisdiction of the county court in a matter exceeding £100, they have a tribunal, local and efficient, to settle the dispute. If they desire the trial to be in the High Court, the arrangement of assize business should be so made as to enable the case to be taken without undue delay at the assizes, and to be disposed of at the appointed date. But these are separate matters, or, rather, if they are related at all, the postponement of High Court reform would render more urgent the allowance of increased county court facilities. There appears to be no reason for making the increased county court facilities conditional on the reform of the assize system, except the fear that the county court may become too formidable a competitor to the High Court. We pointed out in our previous comments that the Committee were not unanimous, and we mentioned Judge TINDAL ATKINSON and Mr. ELLETT as not concurring in the recommendation that the increased facilities in the county court should be conditional on the proposals as to the High Court being approved. In fact, we might have strengthened our observations by reference to other dissentient members, and both Sir JOHN MACDONELL and Mr. BRIDGEMAN signed a dissentient note to the same effect. "If," said they, "the proposed reforms of the High Court are not carried out, or are delayed, the greater, it appears to us, will be the need of reform in the county court." Thus, of the eight members who signed the report, four expressly dissented from the recommendation in question. The ninth member, Mr. BONSEY, signed a separate memorandum, in which he dissented altogether from the proposed facilities for bringing actions by consent in the county court. Putting this opinion aside for the present purpose, it appears that the Committee were evenly divided on the question of the county court facilities being conditional on High Court reform, and it seems clear that no such condition ought to be recognized.

Super-tax on Profits of Limited Liability Companies.

IN AN ARTICLE in the *Times* it is stated that many students of the Budget maintain that the income tax is even now raised another sixpence upon the major part of the industrial income of the country. The super-tax upon incomes over £5,000 a year will, says the writer, apparently be chargeable upon the profits of every joint stock company earning more than that sum, and therefore, in one way or another, upon the dividend of every shareholder in such companies, be his income what it may. "If this is so, the smallest as well as the largest owner of saved money will have to pay the full tax of 1s. 8d. in the pound ostensibly levied only upon the rich." But it has now been stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the super-tax will be charged upon individuals in respect of incomes exceeding £5,000, and not upon corporations in respect of the total amount of the annual profits and gains returned by them. A deduction of income tax at the ordinary rate will be made from the dividend payable to each shareholder, and he will also be required to make a statement of the amount of his income from all sources chargeable under the income tax. It is only when this income exceeds the prescribed amount that he will be liable to the super-tax. Any doubt upon the subject will probably be removed by express statutory provision.

Motions Requiring Only the Signature of Counsel.

WE READ that, upon a discussion on the practice with regard to consent briefs, CHANNELL, J., mentioned that, early in his career at the bar, he had been in the habit of walking about the courts at Westminster, and had often earned a guinea by signing his name to a motion paper. We have spoken with members of the bar whose recollection goes back as far as that of CHANNELL, J., and they all agree that the lines of this future judge must have fallen in pleasant places. Motions of course, such as a rule to

make a submission a rule of court, which was granted upon the mere production of a motion paper signed by counsel, had become exceedingly rare. We have to go back to a more remote period—to the days when rules for the plaintiff to declare; rules for a good jury on a writ of inquiry; rules to plead several matters, and other similar applications, were drawn on a paper signed by counsel, and made a welcome addition to fees which were much smaller than those of the present day.

Revocation of Patents.

THE COMPTROLLER of Patents has again granted an application for the revocation of letters patent under section 27 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, on the ground that the patentee had not given satisfactory reasons why the "patented process" was not carried on to an adequate extent in the United Kingdom. The reasons given were that the failure to work the patent in this country was not due to want of effort on the part of the patentee, but to "the conservatism of English manufacturers," and that he had in fact entered into a *bona-fide* contract giving an option to purchase the patent rights for England. The comptroller was not wholly satisfied with the evidence adduced in support of these allegations, but he decided not to revoke the patent forthwith, but to make an order that it should be revoked on the 31st of December, 1909, unless in the meantime it is shewn to his satisfaction that the patented process is carried on to an adequate extent in the United Kingdom. We hear that the legal profession in the United States are wholly satisfied with the administration of the English Act, and think that a similar enactment by the United States restraining corporations from securing patents without any intention of working them would be beneficial. It is also believed that the law might properly be amended by enacting that a patent which has not been used for a number of years should lapse and be claimed by the State.

Attestation of Wills.

IN OUR issue of the 23rd of January last (p. 212) we weighed the relative authority of two Privy Council cases—*Casement v. Fulton* (5 Moo. P. C. 14) and *Faulds v. Jackson* (6 N. of C., Suppl. 1)—on the question whether witnesses to a will must necessarily subscribe their signatures in the presence of each other. *Faulds v. Jackson* says they need not do so; *Casement v. Fulton*, on the contrary, says that the witnesses must sign in the presence of each other. Besides being preferred in the English courts, and in Ireland, Victoria and Queensland, *Faulds v. Jackson* has been judicially preferred to *Casement v. Fulton* in New Zealand: see *McKenzie v. McKenzie* (1907, 22 N. Z. R. 461). This was a case before a judge of first instance only, and it was not necessary that a choice should be made between the two conflicting authorities, because the will was not properly executed by the testator. The witnesses did not, however, sign in the presence of each other, and it was held that the will would not have been invalid on that account. But this *dictum* is remarkable as illustrating the extraordinary differences of opinion which have been held with respect to these two Privy Council decisions. It was said, in the New Zealand case, that the Privy Council did not really, in *Casement v. Fulton*, decide the point in question, or even give any *dictum* to the effect that witnesses must sign in each other's presence.

Mistakes in Acts of Parliament.

In the *Law Reports* Edition of the Statutes, 1908, there is a request in the notice for binding to substitute pages 467-8, sent with Part III., for pages 467-8 previously delivered in Part II. The mistake consists in the omission of the concluding part of sub-section (1) of section 25 of the Children Act, 1908. The words omitted are the following:—

"and the Secretary of State, with the consent of any society or body corporate established for the reception or protection of poor children or the prevention of cruelty to children, may, subject to such conditions as the Secretary of State may prescribe, appoint officers of the society or body corporate for the purpose."

Our readers will perhaps add the words at page 13 of our copy of the statutes.

The same mistake occurred in the King's Printers' copy of the Act from which the *Law Reports* and our copy were taken, and it was only discovered and corrected in the King's Printers' copy before this Act and others were collected and published in the indexed volume for 1908.

While we are on the subject, we may say that a mistake in printing a copy of the original authenticated vellum print of the Act is less serious than a mistake in the Act itself, due either to the draftsman or the printer. There are numerous mistakes in reference and mistakes of all kinds in Acts which have received the Royal Assent. The printer may incorrectly reproduce the draftsman's manuscript, or mistakes may creep into a Bill during its passage through Parliament. In particular, no systematic supervision is, we believe, exercised over private members' Bills, and it may happen under existing arrangements that a Bill, bad in substance or form, or in both, may slip through Parliament because it is not the duty or interest of anyone in particular to stop or improve it. It is for the Legislature, and only for the Legislature, to amend any mistake which the draftsman has made.

The Artisans and Labourers' Dwellings Act, 1879 (42 & 43 Vict. c. 64), s. 22, sub-section 3, provided that loans for the purposes of the Act should be secured by a mortgage in the form set forth in the third schedule thereto. There was no third schedule appended to the Act, and it was necessary to pass a supplementary Act of Parliament (43 Vict. c. 8), declaring that those words were inserted by mistake, and that the section should be read as if the words had not been inserted therein. When it is considered that amendments are often framed hastily without reference to grammar, logic, consistency or intelligibility, it is a matter for wonder that mistakes similar to the one to which we have referred are not more numerous. Would it not be worth while to have an officer appointed whose duty it should be to examine the King's Printers' copy of every statute with the original authenticated Act, and to certify that it is a correct copy?

The Devolution of the Powers of Trustees.

THE judgment of PARKER, J., in *Re Crunden and Meuz's Contract* (1909, 1 Ch. 690) revives speculation as to whether JESSEL, M.R., was justified in *Osborne to Rowlett* (13 Ch. D. 774) in attempting to broaden the doctrine of the court as to the devolution of the powers of trustees. The tendency of the court has been to rest this matter on narrow and artificial distinctions, and this tendency is very strongly emphasized in the present judgment. In the cases which occurred before the Conveyancing Act, 1881, the question was usually whether a devise of the trust estate became a trustee in the full sense, so as to be able to perform a trust for sale; and it was settled before *Osborne to Rowlett* that he could, if the trust was originally expressed to be imposed on the trustees, *their heirs and assigns*, but not, if it was imposed on the trustees and *their heirs* without mentioning assigns. Thus in *Cooke v. Crawford* (13 Sim. 91) real estate was devised to three trustees upon trust that they or the survivor or the heirs of the survivor should sell. Two of the trustees disclaimed; the third acted in the trusts and devised the estate. SHADWELL, V.C., held that the devisee could not sell, and that the trustee should not have devised the trust estate, but should have let it descend to his heir, who could then have performed the trust. But in *Titley v. Wolstenholme* (7 Beav. 425), where the limitation was to the trustees, *their heirs and assigns*, and the trust was to be performed by the trustees, and the survivor of them, and his heirs or assigns, Lord LANGDALE, M.R., treated the word "assigns" as empowering the surviving trustee to devise the trust estate, and to place the devisee in the position of trustee. As the surviving trustee was not authorized to appoint a new trustee during his life, this construction, though straining the meaning of "assigns," was, he said, necessary in order to give it any effect at all. But apart from this, Lord LANGDALE considered the devolution of the trust upon the heir to be so inconvenient that he would, apparently, have come to the same conclusion had the word

"assigns" not been included, and in spite of *Cooke v. Crawford*. The testator, he pointed out, could not have placed any personal confidence in the heir of the survivor, since he could not know who the survivor would be.

The decision in *Titley v. Wolstenholme* made it easy for JESSEL, M.R., in *Osborne to Rowlett* (*supra*) to depart from the narrow view adopted in *Cooke v. Crawford*, and to hold that, where the estate was devised to trustees and their heirs, the devisees of the last surviving trustee became trustee and could perform a trust for sale. "The true view," he said, "appears to me to be this: that the person to execute the trust for sale is the person who takes the estate, not by accident, so to speak, but in accordance with the provisions of the will. There is a trust annexed to the estate, and when we find who is the person who takes the estate under the will, then we find who is the person to execute the trust." Following this out, he held that the devise by the will of a fee simple estate to the trustees authorized the survivor to devise the estate, and the devisees consequently became trustee. He regarded *Titley v. Wolstenholme* (*supra*) as impliedly overruling *Cooke v. Crawford*, and he himself was willing, so far as he could, expressly to overrule it.

Cooke v. Crawford being thus decently buried, it seemed that a great simplification had been introduced into conveyancing, and probably nothing more would have been heard of this difficulty, but that in *Re Morton and Hallett* (15 Ch. D. 143) the Court of Appeal dug *Cooke v. Crawford* up again, and suggested that there might be some life in it. In that case it was not necessary to consider the point at all, since there had been no devise of the trust estate, and the only question was whether the heir of the survivor of the trustees could sell. It was quite in accordance with *Osborne to Rowlett* to hold that he could, and reference to *Cooke v. Crawford* was apparently irrelevant; but two members of the Court of Appeal—BAGGALLAY and JAMES, L.J.J.—said that they were not prepared to treat it as overruled. Then, however, came the Conveyancing Act, 1881, which prevented any further possibility of the trust estate going either to the heir or the devisee of the surviving trustee, and consequently *Cooke v. Crawford* at length died a natural death, and the particular point on which JESSEL, M.R., dissented from it cannot again arise. But not so with *Osborne to Rowlett* and the doctrine there laid down, and the present decision in *Re Crunden and Meux's Contract* (*supra*) shews that the point of controversy has simply been shifted from one word to another. Formerly the question was whether the original devise had been to the trustees and their heirs, or to the trustees, their heirs and assigns. Now, "assigns" is necessarily meaningless, but the word "heirs" is also sometimes omitted, and it has to be considered whether a limitation to the trustees, without mentioning heirs, enables the trust to devolve upon the representatives of the surviving trustee.

It is the natural inference from *Osborne to Rowlett* that the trust in such a case devolves. Since the testator can in the nature of things place no personal confidence in the heir of the survivor, the use of the word "heirs" has no further effect than to define the estate taken by the trustees, and for that purpose it is surplusage. The trustees take an estate in fee simple whether heirs are mentioned or no. Moreover, if heirs are mentioned, the Conveyancing Act, 1881, comes in and says that the heir shall neither take the estate nor perform the trust; but that both estate and trust shall devolve upon the personal representative of the surviving trustee; that is, the Legislature has declared that, even if the heir is mentioned as a person to perform the trust, no attention shall be paid to the testator's wishes, but that a different person—namely, the personal representative—shall be substituted. This being so, it seems futile to mention "heirs," and the result of *Osborne to Rowlett*, enforced as it has been by the statute, would seem to be to carry all the powers of the trustees to the personal representative of the last survivor (see *Re Waidani*, 1908, 1 Ch. 123), though they may be ousted from their position as trustees by the appointment of new trustees: *Re Roulledge* (1909, 1 Ch. 280).

If this view had been accepted, a difficulty of not infrequent occurrence in conveyancing would have been got rid of, and nobody would have suffered any inconvenience. In the present case, however, of *Re Crunden and Meux's Contract* (*supra*) PARKER, J., has looked askance at *Osborne to Rowlett*, with its doctrine that the estate carries the

trust, and has held that the trust can only be performed by persons mentioned in the will, or others substituted for them by statute; that is, if "heirs" are mentioned, then under section 30 of the Conveyancing Act, 1881, the personal representatives of the surviving trustee, who are substituted for heirs, can perform the trust for sale; if "heirs" are not mentioned, then new trustees must be appointed. There has been an Irish decision to the same effect: *Re Ingleby Boak and Norwich Union Insurance Co.* (13 L. R. Ir. 326). But this view of the law seems to be at once unnecessary and unfortunate. It revives the notion that the testator placed some personal confidence in the heirs of the surviving trustee—a notion sufficiently disposed of both by Lord LANGDALE and Sir GEORGE JESSEL. Surely, when the sole question is how to get over a conveyancing difficulty, the authority of these judges should have been sufficient justification for taking a broad view of the law. The decision renews difficulties which, since the Conveyancing Act, 1881, might well have been treated as obsolete.

Reviews.

Lord Halsbury's Laws of England.

THE LAWS OF ENGLAND: BEING A COMPLETE STATEMENT OF THE WHOLE LAW OF ENGLAND. By the Right Honourable the Earl of HALSBURY, Lord High Chancellor of Great Britain, 1885-86 1886-92, and 1895-1905, and other Lawyers. VOL. VI: COMPULSORY PURCHASE OF LAND AND COMPENSATION; CONFLICT OF LAWS; CONSTITUTIONAL LAW (PARTS I.-V.). Butterworth & Co.

The fifth volume of this work, dealing with Company Law, has had to be kept back for the sufficient reason that the passing of the Companies (Consolidation) Act, 1908, has necessitated a revision of its contents. The Act, indeed, does not materially change the law, but it supersedes all the previous Companies Acts, and it would have been a pity to issue the volume in a form based upon obsolete legislation. The present volume continues the statement of the law in the full and detailed manner which promises to make the work a library in itself. Of the three articles which compose it, the first—Compensation—has been contributed by the Lord Chief Justice and Mr. C. E. Allan; Conflict of Laws is the work of Sir Thomas Raleigh, K.C., and Messrs. Gwyer, Greene, and Brierly, all Fellows of All Souls; and Constitutional Law has been treated by Mr. W. S. Holdsworth, also of Oxford reputation, and Messrs. Wavell Ridges, Mervyn White-Winton and Alfred Hildersheimer; so that the publishers have not been sparing in their efforts to obtain competent assistance, and they are to be congratulated in obtaining Lord Alverstone's assistance in a branch of the law in which he has had large experience.

The article on Compensation is marked both by care and precision in the statement of the law, and by completeness in the authorities which are referred to; for instance, on special adaptability as an element in compensation, a matter which has recently come into prominence in *Re Gough and Aspatria, &c., Water Board* (1904, 1 K. B. 417) and *Re Lucas and Chesterfield Gas, &c., Board* (1909, 1 K. B. 16). The inclusion of a reference to the latter case shews that the volume has been brought as closely up to date as possible. And generally the section on the circumstances which give rise to a right to compensation, whether lands are taken or not, and the extent of the right, is fully illustrated by reference to the authorities. Parts I. to XIII. deal with compensation generally—that is, with the provisions of the Lands Clauses Act as they have been expounded by the courts; Part XIV. takes up special aspects of the subject—commercial undertakings, land required for government purposes, land required for local government purposes, &c.—and states the requirements of the special statutes. The article on Conflict of Laws treats with similar fulness of the matters which usually fall within the scope of the older term "private international law"; that is, domicile, property, immovable and moveable, contract, &c., where foreigners or foreign countries are concerned. To pick out only one subject from an exhaustive statement of the law, Part VII., Section 4, on the law governing contracts, enumerates very clearly the circumstances which attract to a contract a particular system of law when the parties have not expressed their intention on the point—a matter on which *Lloyd v. Guibert* (L. R. 1 Q. B. 115), and the judgment of Bowen, L.J., in *Jacobs v. Crédit Lyonnais* (12 Q. B. D. 589), are leading authorities. The article on Constitutional Law commences this subject, and deals, *inter alia*, with the title to the Crown, and the royal prerogative, including a section on grants by the Crown. The numerous cross-references increase the utility of the work.

The Law of Trusts.

A DIGEST OF THE LAW RELATING TO PRIVATE TRUSTS AND TRUSTEES. By WALTER GRAY HART, LL.D. The "Law Notes" Publishing Office.

This book, it is stated in the preface, contains the materials on which the Trusts Bill, 1908, to codify the law of private trusts, was based, and the author, who was the draftsman of the Bill, expresses his opinion that the law on this subject has arrived at a stage in which it might with advantage be stated in the form of a code of the type of the Bills of Exchange Act, 1882, and other similar recent statutes; but he recognizes that there is, as we have recently pointed out, a considerable body of judicial and professional opinion opposed to this view. This is, however, immaterial in regard to the present book, which is certainly useful as a digest, whatever might have been the effect of the Bill as a code. To cast the law into the rigid frame of a code is one thing; but to prepare a careful digest of the existing law is quite a different matter, and one which, on such a subject as the law of trusts, cannot fail to be of service to the practitioner. The author gives the text of the Bill for the purpose of stating the propositions to be deduced from the statutes and the cases, and then discusses the various authorities upon which each proposition is founded.

The classification of trusts has been productive of some confusion among the text writers from the failure to see that a trust, whenever made out from the words of the instrument, is express, although the words may *prima facie* be doubtful. Thus a precatory trust is express and not implied. This is recognized here, and the term "implied trust" is reserved for such trusts as arise by implication of law. Sometimes the statement of the equitable rule is left judiciously elastic. Thus a trustee's right to be indemnified by a co-trustee who has had the benefit of a breach of trust is well established; but in *Bahin v. Hughes* (31 Ch. D., p. 395) Cotton, L.J., declined to place any definite limitation on this right of indemnity, and Mr. Hart says generally, "The court may, if in the circumstances it appears just to do so, order any one trustee to indemnify the other or others." But to follow the book in any detail would be a long task. It represents a careful examination of the law of trusts, both case and statute law, and will be useful upon any future attempt to reproduce the law in statute form, and also, apart from such attempt as a well-arranged and concise statement of the existing law. Its size forbids its being a complete statement, but we may notice that it does not seem to touch on a point of frequent practical importance—how far a trustee here can execute trusts of property abroad under a power of attorney, and similarly when the trustee is abroad and the property here: see *Stuart v. Norton* (14 Moo. P. C., p. 33), *Re Helling and Merton's Contract* (1893, 3 Ch. 269). Clearly he can do merely administrative acts, as the execution of a specific conveyance, by attorney, and apparently also he can delegate discretion when this is essential for carrying on the trust business. But there is not so much authority on the point as the practitioner would sometimes like to have.

Criminal Appeals.

THE CRIMINAL APPEAL REPORTS, WITH SUBJECT INDEX, TABLES OF CASES AND STATUTES CITED, AND THE CRIMINAL APPEAL ACT, 1907, AND AMENDING AND EXTENDING ACTS. Edited by HERMAN COHEN, Barrister-at-Law. VOL. I. Stevens & Haynes.

These reports, which have been coming out as occasion required in unbound numbers, have now been published as the first volume of a new series. The criminal law of this country is passing through an important and critical period in its history. Until this time last year, every judge was, up to a certain point, a law to himself. In many respects his discretion was unquestioned and unquestionable. His decisions in law were subject to no appeal or revision except by his own wish. His sentences could only be altered by the exercise of the Prerogative. Now all is changed; and not only is there an appeal by right on every point of law, but the whole judicial conduct, discretion and mode of procedure is being standardized and examined. While this process is going on it is of importance to every one concerned to know what ideals the Court of Criminal Appeal have set up, and what lines they are likely to follow in dealing with any particular case. Many of the reports in this volume appear solely with the object of throwing light on these matters, and have, therefore, rather a temporary than a permanent value. Their value, however, is beyond doubt.

Magistrate's Practice.

THE MAGISTRATE'S GENERAL PRACTICE: BEING A COMPENDIUM OF THE LAW AND PRACTICE RELATING TO MATTERS OCCUPYING THE ATTENTION OF COURTS OF SUMMARY JURISDICTION. WITH AN APPENDIX OF STATUTES AND RULES, LIST OF PUNISHMENTS, CALENDAR FOR MAGISTRATES, &c. By C. M. ATKINSON,

Stipendiary Magistrate for the City of Leeds. Stevens & Sons; Sweet & Maxwell.

For a short period this book was called *The Magistrate's Annual Practice*, but no new edition was published between 1900 and 1908. We are rather at a loss to account for the fact that so long an interval should have elapsed between the editions, for it is a very good book by a writer who is a master of his subject, and who has had a long experience of the practical working of a police-court. Speaking generally, a magistrate will find in the book everything he is likely to want in the course of an ordinary day's work. The book is clearly written, accurate and reliable. A very large number of relevant Acts of Parliament have been passed, and many important decisions have been given, since the last edition was published. In consequence much of the book has been rewritten, and its bulk has considerably increased. It is now up to date, and we can confidently recommend it to all members of the profession whose business takes them into courts of summary jurisdiction.

Weights and Measures.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES: BEING THE WEIGHTS AND MEASURES ACTS, 1878 TO 1904; THE BOARD OF TRADE REGULATIONS, 1907; STATUTORY PROVISIONS RELATING TO THE SALE AND CHECKING OF VARIOUS COMMODITIES BY WEIGHT AND MEASURE, TOGETHER WITH THE PRINCIPLES OF WEIGHING AND MEASURING. By JAMES ROBERTS, Barrister-at-Law, Associate of the Institution of Electrical Engineers. THIRD EDITION. Charles Knight & Co. (Limited).

This book may certainly be called a law book, but it is far more than that. It is an exhaustive treatise upon the whole subject of weighing and measuring, and is intended primarily for the use of inspectors appointed to carry out the provisions of the Acts. All the various machines for weighing or measuring all sorts of commodities are described scientifically with diagrams and plans. Valuable practical directions are given for testing appliances; and a fair knowledge of mathematics is required in order to read many portions of the book with intelligence. An inspector, however, must also know something of the law. Here, therefore, we have the text of all Acts material, with useful notes and references to all important decided cases. It is a book full of learning of various sorts, and of great value to the class for whose benefit it is intended.

Workmen's Compensation Cases.

BUTTERWORTH'S WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES. VOL. I, NEW SERIES: BEING A CONTINUATION OF WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION CASES, VOLS. I.-IX. Edited by the late R. M. MINTON SENHOUSE, Esq. CONTAINING REPORTS OF CASES DECIDED UNDER THE WORKMEN'S COMPENSATION ACTS DURING THE PERIOD SEPTEMBER, 1907, TO AUGUST, 1908. Edited by His Honour Judge RUEGG, K.C., and F. J. COLTMAN, Barrister-at-Law. Butterworth & Co.

Everyone who has much to do with disputed claims under the Workmen's Compensation Acts is familiar with the very useful series of reports of such cases edited by the late Mr. Minton Senhouse. It would have been a great loss if this successful series had been allowed to come to an end. We are glad to know it is to be continued under a new title and in an improved form; and we have no doubt the new series will be as successful as the old. If anything could guarantee the thorough efficiency of the volume, the name of Judge Ruegg as one of the editors would do so. We are glad to see that a number of Irish and Scottish decisions are henceforth to be included.

Licensing Cases.

DIGEST OF LICENSING CASES, CONTAINING AN ABSTRACT OF THE CASES DECIDED UNDER THE LICENSING AND REVENUE ACTS RELATING TO INTOXICATING LIQUORS. SECOND EDITION. By WILLIAM MACKENZIE and H. DRYSDALE WOODCOCK, Barristers-at-Law. Butterworth & Co.; Shaw & Sons.

This is a useful little collection of cases decided in the superior courts on the subject of licensing. The practitioner at licensing sessions will find it extremely handy, in the press of business, when it is impossible to immediately obtain any volume of reports he may require. It is, in fact, somewhat more than a mere digest, as the reasons for each decision are summarized, and often short extracts from the judgments are given. This new edition is acceptable, and is an improvement on the first edition in two respects—first, the cases are better arranged; and secondly, there are more of them.

Books of the Week.

The Factory and Truck Acts. By the late ALEXANDER REDGRAVE, C.B., her late Majesty's Chief Inspector of Factories, &c. Eleventh Edition. By CHARLES F. LLOYD, Barrister-at-Law. Statutory Orders, Regulations, Special Rules and Forms. Revised by W. PEACOCK, of the Home Office. Shaw & Sons; Butterworth & Co.

The Digest of Justinian. Translated by CHARLES HENRY MONRO, M.A., Barrister-at-Law. Vol. II. Cambridge: At the University Press.

Kime's International Law Directory for 1909; containing a Selected List of Trustworthy Legal Practitioners in Most of the Principal Towns Throughout the Civilized World, with Telegraphic Code and Short Appendix. Established by PHILIP GRABURN KIME. Eighteenth Annual Issue. Butterworth & Co.

Aids to Forensic Medicine and Toxicology. By WILLIAM MURRELL, M.D., F.R.C.P., Physician to and Lecturer on Clinical Medicine in the Westminster Hospital, &c. Seventh Edition. Sixteenth Thousand. Baillière, Tindall & Cox.

Correspondence.

The Demand for More Judges of the King's Bench Division.

[To the Editor of the Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter.]

Sir,—Your observations on a letter of mine on this subject which appeared recently in the *Times* lead me to hope that you will allow me to explain somewhat more fully, and with more technical detail than could be there given, the proposal I ventured to put forward for disposing of the accumulating arrears in the King's Bench Division.

First let me say that, so far from paving the way for an amalgamation of the county court and the High Court, I believe that the plan I suggest would remove the grounds which are in some quarters regarded as rendering such an amalgamation desirable.

There is no doubt that the arrears of actions for trial are a serious matter for litigants and for both branches of the legal profession. When the lists of cases for trial shew each year at the commencement from 500 to 600 cases waiting to be tried, and the number of actions tried barely keeps pace with the number of fresh actions entered for trial from day to day, so that the number of cases waiting does not decrease, the matter is surely one which urgently calls for the prompt attention of those in authority. And such is the state of the case according to the lists for London and Middlesex.

One cause of this state of the lists is undoubtedly the absorption by the Court of Criminal Appeal of a great part of the time, and the prospective absorption of the whole of the time, of three of the judges. This may well necessitate the appointment of more judges of the High Court, even if the suggestion I have made were to be adopted.

According to the latest judicial statistics, there were 1,314 King's Bench actions tried in one year in London and Middlesex. In 574 of these the amount recovered did not exceed the county court limit of £100. Of this number, in 302 actions the amount recovered was less than £50.

These actions could all have been brought in a county court, and all that I am suggesting is that the High Court should create for itself, as part of itself, with proper statutory authority, machinery of the same calibre as that which efficiently disposes of this class of actions in the county court. That it should, in fact, have a lower division of the King's Bench Division for the trial of actions brought in the High Court which could have been brought in the county court or could be remitted to a county court. It is not suggested that the judges of the proposed lower division of the King's Bench Division should be county court judges or should be in any way connected with the county court; but, merely for the purpose of their jurisdiction in the High Court, that they should to that extent have the same status and qualification as county court judges to try actions with or without juries.

If this number of 574 actions were dealt with separately and economically in the way suggested, the arrears would be wiped out at less than a third of the cost to the country compared with the cost of appointing for the purpose additional judges of the High Court. Why should the country pay £5,000 a year to a judge to try actions of a kind which are tried for less than a third of the cost in the county court?

It may be that there is some fundamental flaw in my proposal which I cannot see; but there are advantages which I believe I can see clearly. The greatest one would be the removal of the arrears, and the establishment as part of the High Court of economical machinery for dealing effectually and separately with nearly one half

in number of all its actions tried in court, all of which, or nearly all, are of lesser importance in character and very much shorter in duration. It would be easy to provide for the transfer to the lists of the High Court judges of any cases which ought to be tried by one of them, and *vice versa*.

Almost equally great, as it appears to me would be the gain in separating these cases of lesser importance from those which the judges of the High Court would try. It must be remembered that, though nearly one half in number of the cases would be tried in this lower division of the King's Bench Division, the rest would consist in most instances of cases which would require a much longer time to try. It cannot surely be a good business arrangement to allow the small cases to block and retard the large ones, or, on the other hand, to allow one long case with many witnesses to hold back for a week or more a number of small cases which could be quickly disposed of.

I am afraid I have exceeded all reasonable limits of space, though there are other advantages I could urge in favour of my suggestion.

F. A. S.

[See observations under head of "Current Topics."—ED. S.J.]

CASES OF THE WEEK.

High Court—King's Bench Division.

MANGENA v. WRIGHT. Phillimore, J. 27th and 28th April; 4th May.

DEFAMATION—TWO ACTIONS FOR TWO PUBLICATIONS OF SAME LIBEL.—ADMISSION BY DEFENDANT IN FIRST ACTION THAT LIBEL DEFAMATORY AND UNTRUE—PLEADING IN SECOND ACTION OF FAIR COMMENT AND OF PRIVILEGE—ESTOPPEL.

If, in an action for libel, a defendant has admitted that certain charges which he made against the plaintiff were both defamatory and untrue, when sued subsequently for another publication of them he is not precluded from raising by his pleading the defences of fair comment and of privilege.

DEFAMATION—PUBLICATION OF EXTRACT FROM BLUE BOOK BY NEWSPAPER—PRIVILEGE.

A newspaper publishing an extract from a Blue Book which is defamatory is protected on the ground of privilege if they plead section 3 of the Parliamentary Papers Act, 1840, and prove that the publication of the extract was made bona fide and without malice. Section 3 of that Act applies to such a case.

Houghton v. Plimsoll (Times, 2nd April, 1874) followed.

DEFAMATION—FAIR COMMENT—STATEMENT OF COMMENT.

Comment by one person upon statements made in a privileged document by another which are defamatory and untrue is fair provided that the comment would be fair if the statements made were true.

Reis v. Perry (64 L. J. Q. B. 566) commented upon.

A letter, together with an extract from a Blue Book, was published in a newspaper. Statements in the extract as to the career of Mr. M. were capable of being construed as defamatory. In the letter the writer said of Mr. M., his "interesting career is detailed in the enclosed abstract, for which I trust you will find room in your columns."

Held, that it was open to a jury to find that these words in the letter were words of comment and not of statement.

DEFAMATION—PUBLICATION OF MATTER OF A PUBLIC NATURE AND INTEREST FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION—PRIVILEGE.

The publication of a matter of a public nature and of public interest and for public information is privileged, provided it is published with the honest desire to afford the public information and with no sinister motive.

This was an argument on what was in the nature of a demurrer to a defence in an action of libel brought against the publisher of the *Times*. The pleadings and arguments appear sufficiently from the written and considered judgment of Phillimore J., which was as follows:—

PHILLIMORE, J.—The plaintiff, who says that he comes from Natal, and who certainly belongs to one of the native races of South Africa, brings his action against the defendant, the publisher of the *Times*, for an alleged defamatory libel consisting of a letter published in that journal on the 5th of September, 1906. The latter purports to be written by Sir William Arbuckle, Agent-General for Natal, and to be dated from the Natal Government Agency. It refers to a native petition said to have been forwarded to the King in Council by Mr. Alfred Mangena (that is the plaintiff), and says that he is "the same native who forms the subject of a report," which is to be found in an official Blue Book, and proceeds to say that "his interesting career is detailed in the enclosed abstract for which I trust you will find room in your columns. I think it only right that this information should be in the possession of the individuals, whoever they are, who are making use of this unfortunate native in their ill-advised agitation against the Natal Government." The report referred to then follows.

It contains several statements concerning the plaintiff which are capable of being construed by a jury as defamatory. The defendant pleads, first, that the report is an extract from, or abstract of, a Parliamentary paper report on proceedings within the meaning of the Parliamentary Papers Act, 1840, and was published *bona-fide* and without malice; secondly, that the letter proper contains nothing defamatory of the plaintiff; thirdly, that the words in the letter proper were published under such circumstances as to render them privileged; fourthly, that these words are fair comment upon the matters contained in the extract from the Parliamentary paper. The plaintiff originally replied that the statement of defence disclosed no defence, that the words were not fair comment, that the Parliamentary paper was not published by any person employed by, or acting by, or under any order or authority of either House of Parliament. He traversed the particulars alleged in the defence of privilege, and what he called "contingently admitted," but in fact averred certain new matter. Afterwards the plaintiff got leave to deliver a further reply, pleading an estoppel to the defences of fair comment and privilege. On the 2nd of March the plaintiff obtained an order that the points of law raised by his reply and his further reply be treated as an addition to the questions of law already fixed to be argued. [These were questions of the admissibility of certain evidence with which this report does not deal.] When the hearing came on this supplemental question was treated by the plaintiff, and probably rightly, as more important than that originally set down; and he claimed, and got, the right to begin; and in the result a number of points were submitted for my decision, which had best be taken in the following order: (1) as to the estoppel pleaded in the further reply. The pleading says that in the previous action the defendant imputed to the plaintiff in substance, *inter alia*, the same matters as are alleged against him in the publication now complained of, that the defendant then justified, and the case came on for trial, and thereafter judgment was entered against the defendant on his own admission. If the defendant has admitted that certain charges which he made against the plaintiff were both defamatory and untrue, why is he, when sued for another publication of them, precluded from raising the defences of fair comment and privilege? There is no estoppel. If indeed it is a necessary element in the defence of fair comment that the facts commented on should be true, and if some of the charges in the two publications are the same, the defence of fair comment will fail, because the defendant's admission will be incontrovertible evidence against him that the facts are not true. But though in many cases this is a necessary element in the defence of fair comment, it is not, as I shall show, a necessary element in this case. Moreover, the defendant may plead fair comment, though he will fail in the proof. We are dealing so far with an estoppel in pleading. The plaintiff, in order to obtain the exclusion of the evidence in the former case, asked me to look at the previous publication and the pleadings in the previous action, and compare the two libels to see if there were not charges common to both. I have looked, and in the result I cannot determine this question. There is enough doubt to make it matter for the jury. (2) The next point to be considered is the defence raised by the Parliamentary Papers Act, and the reply to it, which I was asked by the plaintiff to construe as averring that the particular publication in the *Times* was not under the authority of either House of Parliament. The decisions upon sections 2 and 3 of the Parliamentary Papers Act have apparently been few. There was a case of *Houghton v. Plimsoll* tried before Baron Amphlett at Liverpool, and reported in the *Times* of the 2nd of April, 1874, in which he appears to have directed the jury that the third section applied to the publication of an extract from a Parliamentary paper in an ordinary serial magazine. There are, however, some difficulties in understanding the summing up as reported in respect of this and other points. Then there is the ruling of my brother Darling in the case of *Mangena v. Lloyd*, the same plaintiff and the same extract, that section 3 does apply. I agree with these rulings. It seems to me that whereas under section 1 those publishing under the direct authority of either House are given the protection of a summary stay of proceedings, like the remedy given to Ambassadors under the Statute of Anne, and those not acting under the authority of Parliament, but publishing complete copies of Parliamentary papers already published, are given somewhat similar remedy, those who publish an abstract or an extract only are placed in the position of having to plead the statute, and to aver and prove that their publication was *bona-fide* and without malice. There is a little difficulty in the use of the word "print" instead of "publish" in the first part of the third section; but this is not enough to take away the protection given by the plain words of the section. The preamble probably only refers to the first section of the Act, and I should conjecture that the second and third sections were added to the Bill later. (3) The next defence to consider is that raised by paragraphs 5 and 7 of the defence that the letter proper is not defamatory and is alternately fair comment. As to the letter proper not being defamatory, I had for a time great doubt. The apparent construction of the words "his interesting career as detailed in the enclosed extract" would make them a repetition and restatement of the extract, and the extract is not denied to be defamatory. But after hearing counsel for the defendant I am of opinion that it would be open to the jury to find that these are words of comment and not of statement, and that the matter therefore is one for the jury. (4) Then comes the question of comment. Is it fair comment? The plaintiff says it cannot be fair comment because it is founded on untrue statements. No doubt when there is one published document in which the writer partly alleges and partly comments, and of which the sum total is defamatory, the document cannot be justified unless the facts are

true and the comments fair. Because if the facts do not warrant defamatory comment, the comment is not fair, and if the facts as alleged warrant defamatory comment they are defamatory and must be proved to be true. But when one person alleges and another comments this reason does not apply. I think this view, if true in other cases, is especially true when the allegation, as distinct from the comment, is made in a privileged document. If by some unfortunate error a vote in Parliament recites, or a judge in giving the reasons of his judgment states, that which is derogatory to some person, and the charge is mistaken and ill-founded, and a newspaper reports such vote or judgment and proceeds in another part of its issue to comment upon the character of the person affected in terms which would be fair if the charge were well founded, the newspaper which so reports and comments should be entitled to the protection of fair comment. I should observe that the case of *Reis v. Perry* (63 L. J. Q. B. 566) has been misunderstood in some text books. The case only decided that no privilege attaches to an incorrect extract from a public document, even though the extract was officially supplied. The judgment of Wright, J., does discuss a further question, but not so broad a one as that sometimes supposed, and by some writers attributed to the whole court. (5) Lastly comes the plea of privilege. It is admitted by the defendant that there is no case when the privilege has been put exactly in the way in which he seeks to put it. This publication may be considered as a communication by a person having a social or public duty, the Agent-General of Natal having a duty to communicate in the interest of the colony which he represents, and of union and harmony between it and the mother country, facts concerning the career of one who comes from Natal or its neighbourhood and is not known in England, and who is interposing in England between the Government of Natal and the Government of the mother country. Or it may be considered as a communication by a person having a common interest to others having the like interest, even though the community of interest is one shared with all the subjects of the King or all those in the mother country. If it is a public matter and one concerning a man taking for the time a public part, I think this may be so. It may come within the language cited by Lopes, L.J., in *Allbut v. General Council of Medical Education and Registration* (23 Q. B. D., at p. 412): "The publication of a matter of public nature and of public interest and for public information was privileged, provided it was published with the honest desire to afford the public information and with no sinister motive." I think that, at any rate, where the communication is made by a public servant as to a matter within his province it may be the subject of privilege in him, and, if in him, then in the *Times*, because Sir William Arbuckle could only make the communication through some such medium. I think, therefore, that the defendant may go to trial upon this and the other pleas. [The learned judge then dealt with the questions raised as to the admissibility of certain evidence, with which this report does not deal.]—COUNSEL, Jellicoe; Bankes, K.C., and Eustace Hills. SOLICITORS, Metcalfe & Sharpe; Soames, Edwards & Jones.

[Reported by C. G. MORAN, Barrister-at-Law.]

Probate, Divorce, and Admiralty Division.

P. v. P. (OTHERWISE A.). Bargrave Deane, J. 3rd May.

NULLITY—NOTICE TO ATTEND BEFORE MEDICAL INSPECTORS—PROOF—PRACTICE.

An affidavit is sufficient proof that notice has been served upon a respondent in a nullity suit to appear before medical inspectors and has failed to do so.

Husband's suit for nullity of his marriage, on the ground of the respondent's incapacity. Evidence (*in camera*) having been given in support of the petition, counsel for the petitioner proposed to prove formally that the respondent had been served with notice to appear before the medical inspectors appointed by the court, and that she had failed to comply.

BARGRAVE DEANE, J.—I do not think there is any necessity to do so, as there is an affidavit to that effect upon the file. A decree nisi was granted.—COUNSEL, Bayford; Grazebrook. SOLICITORS, Andrew Wood & Co.; Booth & Smees.

[Reported by DIOBY COVENS-PREEDY, Barrister-at-Law.]

Bankruptcy Cases.

Re WALKER. Ex parte CHILD. Phillimore and Coleridge, JJ. 3rd May.

BANKRUPTCY—PRACTICE—PRIVATE EXAMINATION—RIGHT OF COUNSEL FOR WITNESS TO TAKE NOTES—BANKRUPTCY ACT, 1883 (46 & 47 VICT. C. 52), s. 27.

During the examination of a witness under section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, counsel for the trustee objected to counsel for the witness taking notes, and his objection was upheld by the registrar, who said he felt bound by authority.

Held, that the registrar was wrong, and that if he allowed counsel to appear for the witness at all, he must allow him to re-examine the witness, and must, therefore, allow him to take notes.

Appeal against a decision of the registrar of the county court at Bradford (Yorks.), refusing to allow counsel for a witness at a private examination to take notes. In the course of the bankruptcy the court ordered that a witness named Child, a stranger to the bankruptcy, be examined privately under section 27 of the Bankruptcy Act, 1883, in order to obtain information to enable the trustee to decide as to whether proceedings should be taken against the witness. During the examination counsel for the trustee objected to counsel for the witness taking notes of the answers of the witness. The registrar upheld the objection, and refused to allow counsel for the witness to take notes, stating that he considered himself bound by the case of *Re Grey's Brewery Co.* (25 Ch. D. 400), and adjourned the examination to enable counsel for the witness to appeal against his decision. Counsel for the appellant contended that the cases of *Re Breechloading Armoury Co.* (L. R. 4 Eq. 453), *Re Cambrian Mining Co.* (30 W. R. 285; 20 Ch. D. 376), and *Ex parte Waddell, Re Lutscher* (6 Ch. D. 328) were in his favour, and that there was nothing in the decision in *Re Grey's Brewery Co.* to the contrary, except an *obiter dictum* of Chitty, J., as to what appeared to him to be the practice in bankruptcy at the date of that decision. Counsel stated that he only desired to take notes for the purpose of re-examination and not to make any further use of them. Counsel for the respondent was forced to admit that it was really a matter of discretion for the registrar as to whether he should allow counsel to take notes, or, indeed, to be present at all, and that the registrar had not exercised any discretion in the present case.

THE COURT held that counsel for the trustee was wrong in objecting *simpliciter* to counsel for the witness taking notes. If the registrar allowed counsel to be present at all, he must allow him to re-examine the witness, otherwise the registrar would have done better to exclude him. If he were to be allowed to re-examine, it seemed to follow that he must be allowed to take notes. If it had been suggested that terms should be imposed on which he should be allowed to take a note it would have been another matter, but the registrar did not treat it as a question of discretion, and said he felt bound by *Re Grey's Brewery Co.* Without laying down what conditions a registrar might impose as to the future use of the notes, all the court could decide was that under the circumstances of the present case counsel was entitled to take notes and keep them. The court had not to determine whether counsel was entitled to appear for a witness at a private examination, but in practice it was generally allowed. Appeal allowed.—COUNSEL, *Newell; Watson*. SOLICITORS, *Bonks Newell & Hammond*, Bradford; *F. K. Hewlett*, Birmingham.

[Reported by P. M. FRANKS, Barrister-at-Law.]

Solicitors' Cases.

Re T. Eve, J. 4th May.

SOLICITOR—TAXATION AFTER PAYMENT—"SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES"—RESERVATION OF RIGHT TO TAX—PRESSURE—OVERCHARGES—SOLICITORS ACT, 1843 (6 & 7 VICT. C. 73), s. 41.

The reservation of a right to tax on payment of a bill of costs does not, standing alone, amount in all cases to a special circumstance within the meaning of section 41 of the Solicitors Act, 1843; but, taken together with other circumstances, such as overcharges, it may give rise to a right to tax after payment.

This was a summons by a mortgagor to tax mortgagees' bill of costs after payment. The summons was taken out in 1907, and was issued just one day before the twelve calendar months after payment had expired. The grounds for the application were that there were "special circumstances" within the meaning of section 41 of the Solicitors Act, 1843. The alleged special circumstances were: (1) reservation of the right to tax; (2) pressure by the mortgagees; and (3) overcharges in the bill. The other facts sufficiently appear in the judgment. It was contended on behalf of the applicants that *Re Williams, Ex parte Love* (65 L. T. 68) was absolutely on all fours with the present case, and they also relied upon *Re Boycott* (29 Ch. D. 571, 579). It was argued on behalf of the respondents that there were no special circumstances in the present case, and that an overcharge, to be a "special circumstance," must be a gross overcharge: *Re Bayley* (18 Beav. 415). A previous application in the same matter came before the court recently, and is reported *ante*, p. 118.

EVE, J.—This is a summons taken out in 1907 by a mortgagor, asking that certain bills of costs may be taxed, notwithstanding that the bills have been paid. The grounds for the application are these: It is said on behalf of the mortgagor that when he paid the bills he expressly reserved the right to tax. The reservation was made in a letter of the 24th of September, 1906, in which the solicitors of the mortgagees who were trustees reserved to the trustees full power to tax at any time if they should so desire. Under those circumstances the matter was carried to completion. Now, section 41 of the Solicitors Act, 1843, provides that the payment of a bill shall not preclude the court from referring such bill for taxation if the special circumstances of the case shall in the opinion of the court appear to require the same, upon such terms and conditions and subject to such directions as to the court shall seem right, provided the application for such reference shall be made within twelve calendar months after payment. In the present case the summons was issued just one day before the twelve calendar months had expired. That being so, it is contended on behalf of the applicants that the reservation of the right to tax is a special circumstance which entitles them to taxation of the bills notwithstanding pay-

ment, and in support of that contention they rely upon the case of *Re Williams, Ex parte Love*. I am, however, not prepared to hold that a reservation of the right to tax is in all cases a special circumstance within the meaning of the section. There may in some cases be concurrent circumstances which would make a reservation of the right to tax a special circumstance, but, generally speaking, it is not *per se* a ground for taxation, though it is an element not to be lost sight of. Then it is said on behalf of the applicants that there are two other grounds for the application. In the first place, it is said that the conduct of the mortgagees towards the mortgagor has been oppressive, and that that is a special circumstance within the meaning of the section. On the death of the tenant for life it became necessary to call in the mortgages in question, and that led to other mortgages being called in. Notice was given to the mortgagor to pay off the mortgage debt, but I do not see any indication on the part of the mortgagor to comply with the notice, and matters remained very much as they were before the notice was given. The mortgagees then commenced foreclosure proceedings, without, however, going to judgment, but those proceedings had not the desired effect, and the mortgagees then went into possession six months before the mortgage was paid off. Was that such unreasonable conduct on the part of the mortgagees as to amount to pressure? I cannot see that it was. In my opinion the mortgagees were entitled to take such steps as they thought necessary to meet the situation, and the pressure was not such as would amount to a "special circumstance." The next point made by the applicants is that the bills contain charges which are burdensome and excessive, though they did not take the usual course of giving notice of the items which they allege to be excessive. But in the present case, as it happens, I have already dealt with some similar items on a previous application, and held that they were not warranted. I have here, therefore, a reservation of the right to tax, a summons issued within the year, and a bill containing items which ought to be disallowed. Those three things, taken together, amount in my opinion to "special circumstances" within the meaning of the section, and I therefore refer the bill for taxation.—COUNSEL, *Rolt; Cann*. SOLICITORS, *H. J. Adkin*, for Sharp & Weir, Brighton; *A. F. & R. W. Tweedie*.

[Reported by S. E. WILLIAMS, Barrister-at-Law.]

New Orders, &c.

The Procedure under the Patents Act.

The following Rules amending the procedure under section 27 of the Patents and Designs Act, 1907, and the Patents Rules 78 to 81, have been issued:—

In all cases of applications for revocation under section 27 the following procedure will, in future, be adopted:—

- (1) The applicant should simultaneously with his application on Patents Form 24 leave at the office evidence by way of statutory declaration, stating the particulars upon which he relies in support of the allegations contained in the application; the copy of the application delivered to the patentee or his agent, in accordance with Patents Rule 78, should be accompanied with copies of such evidence.
- (2) The patentee should, within fourteen days from the delivery of such copy, or within such further time as the Comptroller may allow, leave at the office evidence by way of statutory declaration stating whether or not the allegations contained in the application are correct; and if they are incorrect giving the particulars upon which he intends to rely in answer to the allegations made by the applicant. Copies of such evidence should at the same time be delivered to the applicant.
- (3) Should the applicant then decide to proceed with his application, he may then leave and deliver further statutory declarations in answer, in accordance with the provisions of the latter part of Rule 79.
- (4) The Comptroller will then intimate to the parties whether, having regard to the circumstances of the case, he considers it desirable and intends to hold a preliminary hearing on the question whether a *prima facie* case has been made in support of the allegations in the application, or whether he intends in ordinary course to deal at one hearing with the whole case, including the further questions whether the patentee can prove that the patented article or process is manufactured or carried on to an adequate extent in the United Kingdom, or can give satisfactory reasons why the article or process is not so manufactured or carried on.
- (5) Should the Comptroller think fit to hold a preliminary hearing as aforesaid, and as a result of such hearing decide that a *prima facie* case has been made in support of the allegations in the application, or should he determine to proceed in ordinary course to deal at one hearing with the whole case, including the further questions mentioned in head (4), then, and in either of the said cases, he will give to the patentee further time for leaving at the office and delivering to the applicant pursuant to Rule 79 evidence by way of statutory declaration with regard to such further questions or either of them and will subsequently give to the applicant under Rule 79, and thereafter, if necessary, to the patentee under Rule 80, further time for leaving further evidence by way of statutory declaration with regard to such questions or either of them in answer or reply as the case may be.
- (6) In the event of an application under section 27 being uncontested by the patentee, the Comptroller in deciding whether costs should be awarded to the applicant will consider whether proceedings under the section might have been avoided, if reasonable notice had been given by the applicant to the patentee before the application was filed.

Societies.

The Law Society.

GENERAL MEETING.

A general meeting of the members of the Law Society was held at the Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, on Friday, the 30th ult., the PRESIDENT, Mr. J. S. Beale (London) taking the chair. Among those present were Mr. William Howard Winterbotham, M.A. (vice-president), Mr. Charles Mylne Barker, Mr. Thomas William Bischoff, Mr. Alfred Hy. Coley (Birmingham), Mr. Frank Dawes, Mr. Walter Dowson, Mr. Robert Ellett (Cirencester), Sir Edward Henry Fraser, D.C.L. (Nottingham), Mr. Samuel Jarrett, M.A., Mr. William Edward Gillett, Sir John Hollams, Mr. Henry James Johnson, Mr. Henry Manisty, Mr. Richard Pennington, Mr. Thos. Rawle, Sir Albert Kaye Rollit, B.A., LL.D., D.C.L., Mr. Charles Leopold Samson, Mr. William Arthur Sharpe, Mr. Richard Stephens Taylor, and Mr. William Melmoth Walters, members of the Council; Mr. John Cullimore (Chester), Mr. Charles Elton Longmore (Hertford), Mr. Charles Henry Morton (Liverpool), Mr. Robert Pybus, M.A. (Newcastle-upon-Tyne), and Mr. Francis Sturge (Bristol), extraordinary members; and Mr. S. P. B. Bucknill, secretary *pro tem.*, and Mr. E. R. Cook, clerk to the committees.

PRIZE AND CERTIFICATES OF MERIT.

The following notice was on the paper of business:—"The President will present the prize and certificates awarded to successful candidates at the Final Examination, in January, 1909." These were as follows:—

Certificates, second-class (in alphabetical order):—Mr. Allen Hoyte Craig, articulated with Mr. F. H. James, of Messrs. James, Mellor & Coleman, London; Mr. Colin Stanley Krause, articulated with Mr. Julius A. White, London; Mr. Artom Anidjar Romain, articulated with Mr. D. A. Romain, London; and Mr. George Robin Thatcher, articulated with Mr. John Attenborough, of London. Third-class (in alphabetical order):—Mr. Alfred Lewis Arnold, articulated with Mr. Lionel B. Mozley, of Messrs. Hicks, Arnold & Mozley, London; Mr. Reginald Chas. Soresby Foster, articulated with Mr. Wm. Woolley, of Messrs. Moody & Woolley, Derby; Mr. John Stoker Hogg, articulated with Mr. Jas. Hy. Rennoldson, of South Shields; Mr. Edwd. Baines Reed, B.A., LL.B. Camb., articulated with Mr. Sydney C. Scott, of Messrs. Scott, Bell & Co., London; and Mr. Thos. Devall Walthall, articulated with Mr. T. W. Walthall, of Birmingham. The following gentlemen did not attend:—Mr. Walter Guy Nicholas Breton, articulated with Mr. Wm. H. Breton, Longton, Staffordshire; and Mr. Thos. Hubert Veasey, articulated with Mr. W. B. King, Royston, and Mr. C. G. Veasey, Baldock, second-class certificates. Mr. Regd. Hy. Barrett, articulated with Mr. Thos. Oerton, of Messrs. Toller, Oerton & Baldson, Barnstaple; Mr. Guy Edwd. Knightly Burne, articulated with Mr. R. H. Thurlow Baker and Mr. W. Grice Hutchinson, both of London; Mr. John Ponsonby MacClellan, M.A. Oxon., articulated with Mr. J. F. Rowlatt, of Messrs. Metcalf, Birkett & Rowlatt, London; Mr. Albert Joseph Mawdsley, articulated with Mr. Fredk. Aneurin Jones, of Messrs. Brighouse, Jones & Co., Southport; Mr. Gerald Peter, articulated with Mr. Claude H. Peter, of Launceston, and Messrs. Busk, Mellor & Norris, London; Mr. Philip Hallowell Richardson, articulated with Mr. John Harrison Richardson, Bradford; and Mr. Walter Gill Seager, articulated with Mr. Chas. Baker and Mr. A. Edwd. Dunn, both of London, third-class certificates. The John Mackrell prize, value about £12, was awarded to Mr. Veasey.

RESIGNATION OF MR. WILLIAMSON.

The PRESIDENT: Since the notice convening the meeting was sent out we have received from our good friend and secretary, Mr. Williamson, the resignation of his office, under medical advice, and I am sure you will all feel, as we do on the Council, that Mr. Williamson filled the office of secretary for forty-six years with the greatest ability and judgment, that he has won the admiration and regard of all the members of the society, equally with the members of the Council, that he has been most helpful and sympathetic to all those, and they are very many, who have sought his advice at various times, and that he gave a constant and close attention to every matter connected with the work of the society and the interest of the profession. And I feel sure that every member of the society, whether present or absent, will feel that the society has lost a most valuable and valued officer, that they will sympathise with Mr. Williamson in the illness which has necessitated his resignation, that they will wish that the relief from work may rapidly lead to his complete recovery, and I think they will approve and confirm the action of the Council in allotting to Mr. Williamson, after forty-six years' service, a retiring pension equal to the amount of his salary. Mr. Williamson's portrait is on our walls, the gift of our old friend Mr. Williams, and it does seem to set our minds back a long way that Mr. Williams, the donor of the portrait, was president, I think, in 1865, two years after the appointment of Mr. Williamson to the office of secretary. I cannot help thinking that it would be pleasant to Mr. Williamson, who is, I am afraid, for the last few days not so well as he was before, to have a resolution of sympathy with him, and with your permission I should like to move:—"That this general meeting of members respectfully tenders to Mr. Williamson the assurance of their appreciation of and gratitude for the eminent services which he has rendered to the profession during his long office of secretary, of the universal esteem and regard in which they hold him, of their earnest wish for his complete recovery, and the enjoyment of many years of health and happiness."

Sir ALBERT ROLLIT, LL.D., D.C.L., said that, as having been an articulated clerk with Mr. Williamson, in Hull, and having since enjoyed lifelong friendship with him, he had the privilege of seconding the proposal. He thought they should remember those who had served the office of president had perhaps a fuller knowledge of the great work Mr. Williamson had done, and it was not only in the ordinary work of his office, but sometimes he made a contribution to the welfare of the society and to the general work of the society, as, for instance, in that welcome which was paid by the whole profession and by the society to those who had done good service in South Africa at the time of the war. He knew nothing that had given more honour and pleasure to the recipients than the reception which was given them in that hall, and the medals they received, and the chief service in that respect was without doubt due to Mr. Williamson.

Mr. CHAS. FORD (London) said that for about forty-six years he was afraid he had been, as some would think, a too active member of the society. During the whole of those years he had received nothing but courtesy, kindness and consideration from Mr. Williamson, and if anything more was to be done in the way of recognising Mr. Williamson's services, it would be his great pleasure to take part in it.

Mr. J. S. RUBINSTEIN (London) said he had also taken an active part in matters connected with the society, and he had been brought a great deal into contact with Mr. Williamson, and although he had had no official commission, he had invariably met with the greatest possible courtesy. Therefore he supported the motion with very great pleasure.

A MEMBER suggested that the number of years should be inserted in the resolution. It simply said Mr. Williamson had served "many years." He thought it would be well to mention the actual number.

The PRESIDENT: Very well, I am quite willing to accept that amendment.

The resolution was carried with acclamation.

LAND TRANSFER ACT.

Mr. RUBINSTEIN said he might perhaps be permitted to say that he had given private notice of a question to the president as to whether he could give any information with regard to the inquiry which was proceeding before the Land Transfer Commission into the working of the Land Transfer Act, and its present position.

The PRESIDENT: There is nothing much to say. At the present time the Commission has risen for the Easter vacation. They will begin again on May 20th. The witnesses who had been recently called had been those representing the profession from the country, and I know what pains had been taken in preparing their evidence, and I hope it has been favourably received. Unfortunately, the Commission does not allow us to attend their sittings and know what goes on before them. They only publish papers, which are very sparse. They do allow us now to have the evidence that has been given, but it comes somewhat late. What I think is in Mr. Rubinstein's mind, and is certainly in mine, is not so much what is going on before the Commission as what we can do possibly to obviate the great inconvenience, and, as we are inclined to believe, the not very strict legality, of the present rules. But on that, unfortunately, I have nothing I can say with advantage. We have approached the Lord Chancellor and asked him to see us. Of course, that has to be done through Sir Kenneth Mackenzie, who has been very unwell, I know, and I know of other business stopped on that account. I hope he will soon be well, and that we may be able to do something in that line, but at present we have nothing to report.

FORM OF OATH IN COURT.

Mr. FORD had given notice of the following resolution:—"That in the opinion of this meeting, the option at present given to the majority of witnesses in his Majesty's courts of justice, of being sworn in one way or another, ought to be discontinued, and one uniform and compulsory form of oath adopted in such cases; and it is hereby referred to the Council to consider and report as to what form of oath they recommend; and it is also referred to the Council to consider and report as to whether it is desirable to substitute solemn affirmations for oaths, as regards witnesses in courts of justice." Before moving it, he said he thought that if the gentlemen who won prizes did not take the trouble to come to receive them at the hands of the president, he thought the ceremony of the distribution might be dispensed with, because it occupied some valuable time which might well be devoted to the disposal of the matters on the paper of business. He then moved the resolution. He said that Mr. Justice Ridley, Sir Gorell Barnes, and Mr. Justice Warrington had referred to what he might call the double-barrelled system of taking the oath, and had taken exception to it. There was the choice between taking the oath by kissing the book, or of making a great demonstration before the court by holding up the hand and taking the oath in the Scotch form. It was very often thrown in the teeth of the profession that all they wanted considered was the question of solicitors' remuneration and bills of costs and so forth, and he thought this was a question which they might very well consider in the public interest. He was perfectly aware that since he had given notice of this motion a Bill had been brought into Parliament which was promoted by a coroner, the details of which were probably as unsatisfactory as those of most Bills that were introduced into the House by members. They did not get that careful consideration which they would have if the Council of the society, for instance, were to consider them professionally. The Bill had been before the committee, and had been subjected to considerable alteration. Originally it provided that it should be compulsory to have the Scotch system, which was most objectionable, and he hoped the Council would take the matter

ng been an
one enjoyed
ponding the
served the
great work
inary work
elfare of
instance, in
the society
time of the
pleasure to
that hall,
respect was

ears he was
nber of the
nothing but
and if any-
Williamson's

an active
en brought
gh he had
and the great-
est very great

inserted in
ved "many
number."
hat amend-

ay that he
to whether
which was
working of

resent time
will begin
called had
and I know
I hope it
ssion does
on before
They do
t it comes
nd, and is
the Com-
venience,
ity, of the
I can say
and asked
r Kenneth
r of other
well, and
resent we

"That in
majority
orn in one
and com-
y referred
oath they
sider and
firmations
s moving
s did not
resident,
used with,
evoted to
en moved
arnes, and
the doub-
tion to it.
e book, or
ag up the
on thrown
l was the
forth, and
consider in
had given
nt which
obably as
into the
ion which
were to
committee,
ly it pro-
m, which
the matter

into consideration. For a witness on entering the witness-box, usually more or less in a nervous state, to be asked to hold up the arm before judge, jury, counsel, and public was a very disquieting operation—he thought he might venture to say a barbarous operation. Kissing the book was also a barbarous operation. He had received a number of letters on the subject, and every one, from registrars and officers of the courts, objected to the Scotch system. A simple method which was adopted in some other countries of laying the hand upon the book would be much better and far less disquieting to the witness. The whole difficulty would be met by that. He had a letter from a registrar of a district court who objected to the Scotch method as cumbersome, and suggested that the hand should be placed on the open Testament at the time of taking the oath, and that in the case of an affirmation the placing the hand on the book should be dispensed with. This practice of placing the hand on the book was customary, he believed, in Spain and Germany, and it was the practice with the Sovereign on ascending the throne. He regretted that these amateurs in Parliament had not come to the society for a suggestion as to the best plan to be adopted. He supposed he would be met with the argument that as there was a Bill in Parliament, and all that Parliament did was the essence of wisdom, it was unnecessary for the society to consider the matter.

A MEMBER rose to order. It did not seem to him that the matter was within the scope of the society. It was not a professional matter at all.

THE PRESIDENT: It is quite true that this is not a professional question, as Mr. Ford himself has said. Of course, it is not a professional question. Solicitors are rarely called upon to give evidence, and, of course, when they do, they speak the truth, whatever may be the form of oath.

MR. FORD: How about our clients?

THE PRESIDENT: They are not our clients as witnesses particularly. However, it is material to notice that the Council could not do anything to carry out this recommendation if they desired to do so, because there is the reason Mr. Ford has given, namely, that there is a Bill actually in Parliament now which has gone through the Standing Committee, and the effect of which is to require that the Scotch form of oath should be adopted unless the witness objects to it. The present mode is that you may take either form, and that has been found to act very well. We are a sufficiently conservative nation in practice—I am not speaking politically—in practice we are sufficiently conservative to wish to keep to old forms, and the old form is preferred in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred. Now they want to say we must use the Scotch form, unless the witness objects. But in any case the Council could do nothing on the Bill, which is only open now to amendment in Committee of the whole House. It has been through the Grand Committee.

TELEPHONES AND AUTOMATIC STAMP APPARATUS.

MR. E. A. BELL (London) moved the following motions, of which he had given notice:—"That the Council be requested to consider: (1) Whether two additional (post-office) telephones can be provided in the telephone room. (2) Whether an automatic stamp distributing apparatus for the use of members can be fixed in the hall." He said he ventured to think that the motions were a piece of domestic legislation, and it was not a question of expense so much as expediency. He did not suppose for a moment that any member of the society or of the Council would consider the question of the expense of putting up the telephone or a stamp machine.

THE PRESIDENT: May I facilitate your proceeding to this question by saying that after you raised the question the Council caused a vote to be taken which they thought established sufficiently the need for an additional telephone?

MR. BELL said that that being the case he would address his remarks to the second resolution, which was nearly in the same category. This was a society of 8,000 members, of which he was told 4,000 were London members, and although there was plenty of facility for writing letters there was no facility for obtaining stamps. He ventured to think the society was in the nature of a club, and in most of the clubs he was acquainted with there were automatic stamp machines. The only way a member was able to obtain a stamp was by sending one of the porters to the nearest post-office for it, if he did not happen to carry one, which it very frequently happened was the case. It would be to the benefit of the society to have an automatic machine, and he had communicated with the post-office authorities and was informed that there was such a machine which was reliable and useful.

MR. RUBINSTEIN seconded the motion. It was a practical business suggestion, and he thought the Council might adopt it.

THE PRESIDENT: Our information apparently is that there is no good machine to be obtained.

MR. BELL said he could give the Council the name of one.

THE PRESIDENT: There may be experimental machines. But we won't discuss it here. We may accept the resolution. We will consider it, and, of course, if it can be done it should be, but our present information is that although you may get machines which are said to be very effective, they are really not worth anything. We will accept the resolution and make further inquiries.

SOLICITOR TO THE TREASURY.

The following notice stood on the paper of business:—"Mr. Harvey Clifton will ask:—(1) Whether any effort was made recently by the Council to secure the appointment of a solicitor to the office of Solicitor to the Treasury. (2) If not, whether any protest against the appoint-

ment of a member of the bar to such solicitorship has been or will be made by the Council."

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Harvey Clifton has written to us that he cannot be present, and he asks that the answer to his inquiries may be stated. The answers to both questions are in the negative. The appointment of a Solicitor to the Treasury who is not by profession a solicitor has been customary for a long time, and when the Council on a former occasion endeavoured to make a protest against it they received a reply of a somewhat curt and unsatisfactory nature, and I do not think it would be wise to expose ourselves to the same again. That answers really both questions that there has been no effort made by the Council as suggested. It is by law and by practice really a bar appointment, not a solicitor's, and therefore no protest has been made or will be.

A MEMBER: Is it in accordance with the Solicitors Act that someone should act as a solicitor without being a solicitor?

THE PRESIDENT: No, not in the case of a member of the bar in a Government appointment. They are called Government solicitors, solicitors to the Treasury, but they are not necessarily solicitors.

MR. FORD said it seemed a mysterious thing that this misnomer should continue and that the society were not prepared to pursue the matter because they did not get a courteous answer. Let the matter be put in another position and a request be made that the proper name should be given to the appointment.

THE PRESIDENT: We have secured to the profession, by the arrangement made some years ago, the solicitorship to some Government offices. My advice would be that it is better to keep such appointments as we have under that arrangement than to seek to dispossess the bar of what they have. May I take seriously your objection, Mr. Ford, to the distribution of prizes on these occasions? It carries my sympathy to a great extent, because I do not think that to present three or four certificates to gentlemen and so occupy the time of the meeting is acting quite contrary to the feeling of the members. I believe it is only a Council regulation. I think you may leave it to the discretion of the Council whether the prizes and certificates should or should not be distributed on these occasions.

MR. FORD: The practice emanated from the Council and I hope they will get rid of it.

THANKS TO PRESIDENT—LAND TRANSFER ACT.

MR. RUBINSTEIN proposed a vote of thanks to the president. He observed that he would like to say with reference to the president's answer to his question regarding land transfer, that he had proposed to bring forward, as the Council knew, a very drastic resolution on the subject, but in deference to the view expressed to him that the matter was *sub judice*, he had refrained from so doing, but the profession were watching the Commission very closely.

MR. FORD seconded the resolution, which was carried.

THE PRESIDENT briefly returned thanks.

Law Students' Journal. The Law Society.

HONOURS EXAMINATION.—MARCH, 1909.

At the examination for honours of candidates for admission on the Roll of Solicitors of the Supreme Court, the Examination Committee recommended the following as being entitled to honorary distinction:—

FIRST CLASS.

CYRIL STANLEY THOMAS, who served his clerkship with Mr. Austen Whetham, of Bridport, and Messrs. Hatchett Jones, Bisgood & Marshall, of London.

SECOND CLASS.

[In Alphabetical Order.]

Henry Sydney Hoffman Hall, who served his clerkship with Mr. Ernest Martineau, of the firm of Messrs. Ryland, Martineau & Co., of Birmingham, and Mr. Headley Faithful Norris, of the firm of Messrs. Busk, Mellor & Norris, of London.

Thomas Harston, who served his clerkship with Mr. Templer Lethbridge Down, of London.

Francis James Ridler, LL.B. Lond., who served his clerkship with Messrs. Kite, Broomhead & Kite, of Taunton, and Messrs. Sharpe, Pritchard & Co., of London.

Arthur Gerald Vavasour Yates, who served his clerkship with Mr. Charles Blunt, of the firm of Messrs. Mair, Blunt & Brocklehurst, of Macclesfield.

THIRD CLASS.

[In Alphabetical Order.]

Estyn Douglas Apsimon, LL.B. Liverpool, who served his clerkship with Mr. O. W. Owen, of the firm of Messrs. Lightbound, Owen & MacIver, of Liverpool.

Frank England, B.A., LL.B. Camb., who served his clerkship with Messrs. Looking & Holdich, of Hull.

Robert Norris, B.A. Oxon, who served his clerkship with Mr. James W. Alsop, of the firm of Messrs. Alsop, Stevens, Crook & Co., of Liverpool.

Albert Edwin Sockett, who served his clerkship with Mr. William Jones Malcolm, of Stockton-on-Tees; Mr. Edward William Dawes, of Middlesbrough; and Messrs. Crowders, Vizard & Oldham, of London.

Charles James Widdows, who served his clerkship with Mr. Henry James Widdows, of Leigh, Lancashire.

The Council of the Law Society have accordingly given class certificates and awarded the following prizes of books:—

To Mr. Thomas—The Clement's Inn prize—value about £10; The Daniel Reardon prize—value about 20 guineas; and the John Mackrell prize—value about £12.

The Council have given class certificates to the candidates in the second and third classes.

Forty-one candidates gave notice for the examination.

By order of the Council,

S. P. B. BUCKNILL, Assistant Secretary.

Law Society's Hall, Chancery-lane, London, April 30th, 1909.

Calls to the Bar.

The following gentlemen were called to the bar on Wednesday:—

LINCOLN'S INN.—C. E. Davies (certificate of honour, C.L.E. Easter, 1909), Trinity Hall, Camb. (First Class, Parts I. and II. Law Tripos), B.A., LL.B.; G. P. Evans, Magdalen Coll., Oxford, B.A., J.P.; G. H. Mills, Univ. Coll., Oxford; M. H. W. Hayward, St. John's Coll., Camb., LL.B.; Nowrojee Jehangir Wadia, St. John's Coll., Camb.; A. B. C. Merriman-Labour; S. Birkbeck, London Univ.; Pestonji Cursetji Tarapore, F.R.G.S.; F. W. P. Cockerell, New Coll., Oxford; I. A. W. McGowan, Jesus Coll., Camb., B.A., LL.B.; M. Bonham-Carter, Ball. Coll., Oxford, B.A.; Rajendra Narayan Chaudhuri; G. M. Simmonds (late a solicitor).

INNER TEMPLE.—W. T. Swan Sonnenschein, B.A. Oxford, certificate of honour, Easter term, 1909; C. H. Harper, B.A., Oxford; A. G. C. Collins, Camb.; W. M. Hughes-Hughes, B.A. Oxford; G. D. Pryor, B.A. Camb.; C. Lall, Oxford; W. E. Stanford, B.A., Oxford; J. P. Elden; J. N. Sintra; J. Aitken, B.A., LL.B. Camb.; F. Fenton, M.A., Camb.; G. C. Williams, B.A., London.

MIDDLE TEMPLE.—W. F. Swords, B.A., LL.B. Camb., B.Sc. London, first class Law Tripos, late scholar of St. John's College, Cambridge, MacMahon Law Scholar, certificate of honours, C.L.E. Michaelmas, 1908, Barstow Scholarship, 1909; D. J. White, M.A. Dublin, ex-classical scholar, Trinity College, Dublin, barrister-at-law, Ireland; K. Francis, B.A., Pemb. Coll., Camb.; C. H. Campagnac; I. S. Fisher, M.A. Edin.; J. B. Thompson, B.A., Pemb. Coll., Camb.; H. O'Neill, M.D.; E. T. Dale; E. C. de Neufville, B.A. Oxford; Mudiyal Kesava Padmanabha Pillai, M.A. Edin.; E. Rosewall; St. John Hutchinson, B.A. Oxford; R. V. J. S. Hogan, B.A. Camb.; R. T. Cox; Syed Ahmad; Binod Behari Lal; J. C. A. Leclézio; Kow Soon Kim; J. C. Jackson.

GRAY'S INN.—W. F. Newberry; W. T. W. Idris; Shivharan Das, B.A., Pemb. Coll., Oxford, B.A., Allahabad Univ.; Pramatha Nath Chatterjee, M.A., Calcutta Univ.; and W. H. Prescott.

Legal News.

Appointment.

Mr. FREDERICK CHARLES BROGDEN, solicitor, of Lincoln, has been appointed Official Receiver for the Bankruptcy Districts of the County Courts holden at Lincoln and Boston, as from the 1st of May, 1909, in succession to Mr. Richard John Ward, resigned.

Changes in Partnerships.

Dissolutions.

ARTHUR ROBERT CHAMBERLAYNE and JOHN CHARLES BROOKHOUSE, solicitors (Chamberlayne & Brookhouse), 7, New-square, Lincoln's-inn, London. April 28.

CECIL PRICHARD HENDERSON and THOMAS CECIL SYMES, solicitors (Henderson & Symes), Dunster House, 12, Mark-lane, London. April 27.

WILLIAM SLARK, PATRICK HARRINGTON EDWARDS, and JAMES McDONALD COBBAN, solicitors (Slark, Edwards, & Co.), 33, Southampton-street, Strand, London. April 21. So far as the said William Slark is concerned; the said Patrick Harrington Edwards and James McDonald Cobban will continue to practise in co-partnership at 33, Southampton-street, Strand, aforesaid, as heretofore. [Gazette, April 30.]

HAROLD AUGUSTUS FARMAN and WALLACE GRAHAM HOZIER COOPER-KING, solicitors (Farman & King), Birkbeck Bank-chambers, High Holborn. Feb. 28.

JOHN FRANCIS TURNER and JOSEPH WILLIAM TURNER, solicitors, (Turner & Sons), Preston and Lytham. Dec. 31. The said Joseph William Turner will carry on the said business under the style or firm of Turner & Sons. [Gazette, May 4.]

General.

The Lord Chancellor on Wednesday, says the *Times*, in reply to a deputation from Lancashire municipalities asking that more time might be given to the trial of civil causes of assizes, said that, in conjunction with the Lord Chief Justice and Lord Gorell, he had considered the question with a view of seeing in what shape proposals on the subject might be put before the Cabinet.

On the 30th ult. the Royal Assent was given by Commission to the Army (Annual) Act.

On the 3rd inst. the Judicial Committee resumed its sittings after the Easter Vacation. The list includes five Indian and four Colonial and other appeals. There are fourteen judgments for delivery in appeals heard before the vacation.

The Home Secretary has appointed a Committee to consider what should be the procedure of Royal Commissions in regard to the arrangement of business, the selection and reception of evidence, the decision of questions arising on the terms of reference, and any other matters of order and procedure, with special reference to the duties and powers of the chairman in regard thereto. The Committee is constituted as follows:—The Right Hon. Lord Balfour of Burleigh, K.T. (chairman), the Right Hon. Earl of Radnor, Mr. W. P. Byrne, C.B., of the Home Office, Mr. T. G. Ashton, M.P., and Mr. C. E. H. Hobhouse, M.P. The secretary to the Committee is Mr. H. B. N. Mothersole, Royal Commissions House, Old Palace-yard, Westminster.

Some years ago, says an American journal, a man in Nantucket was tried for a petty offence, and sentenced to four months in jail. A few days after the trial, the judge who had imposed sentence, in company with the sheriff, was on his way to the Boston boat, when they passed a man busily engaged in sawing wood. The man stopped his work, touched his hat politely, and said: "Good morning, your Honour." The judge, after a careful survey of the man's face, asked: "Isn't that the man I sentenced to jail a few days ago?" "Yes," replied the sheriff, with some hesitation, "that's the man. The fact is, Judge, we—er—we don't happen to have anybody else in jail just now, so we thought it would be a sort of useless expense to hire someone to keep the jail four months just for this one man. So I gave him the jail key and told him it would be all right if he'd sleep there o' nights."

At the request of the Central Land Association, says a writer in the *Times*, the Committee of the Land Agents' Society sent out in January last to all their members having charge of agricultural estates a request for precise information as to the actual cost of repairs and maintenance in connexion with the assessment of their respective estates, accompanied by a form to be filled up with figures obtained from the estate books. In compliance with this request returns have now been received from agents having the management of 241 estates in England and Wales, showing the actual expenditure upon them under the several headings mentioned, expressed in percentages upon the gross rental of the several estates. The area to which the figures apply is 1,955,958 acres, and such figures represent the average of the results of the last five years. From these figures it appears that the average expenditure under the different headings, expressed in terms of percentage upon gross rental, are as follows:—(1) Repairs, 20.820 per cent.; (2) new works necessary to maintain rents, 3.110 per cent.; (3) management and legal fees, 6.021 per cent.; and (4) insurance, 1.185 per cent. The total average expenditure under all these headings works out at 29.501 per cent. of the gross rental. It should be remembered in this connexion that the statutory deductions for repairs and maintenance amount only to one-sixth (or 16.6 per cent.) in the case of buildings and one-eighth (or 12.5 per cent.) in the case of land.

The formal announcement of the decision arrived at by the Benchers of the Inner Temple at their meeting on April 23rd upon the case of Mr. Shyamaji Krishnavarma, the head of "India House," Highgate, was, says the *Times*, placed on the screen at the entrance to the Inner Temple Hall on Saturday. The notice disbarred Mr. Krishnavarma, and removing his name from the books of the society, is as follows:—"Inner Temple. At a Parliament holden Friday, 20th April, 1909. Whereas at a Bench Table holden on the 10th March 1909 a Committee was appointed to consider and report as to whether any and what steps should be taken in connexion with letters purporting to be written by Mr. Shyamaji Krishnavarma, a barrister of this Society, in *The Times* on the 20th February and the 10th March 1909 with power to collect any further materials. And Whereas this Committee presented a Report dated the 23rd March, 1909. And whereas this Report was laid before the Bench and was received and adopted on the 25th day of March 1909. And Whereas at the Bench Table holden on the 23rd day of April 1909, It was Ordered—That the Bench, having read and considered the letter dated the 17th February 1909, addressed by Mr. Shyamaji Krishnavarma to *The Times* newspaper and published therein on the 20th February 1909, and the quotation therein from the *Indian Sociologist*, and having read and considered the written statement of Mr. Shyamaji Krishnavarma sent by him to the Bench in his defence from which it appears that he admits responsibility for the letter to *The Times* and for the articles appearing in the *Indian Sociologist*, is of opinion that the conduct of Mr. Shyamaji Krishnavarma, a Barrister of this Society, in publishing the said letter was unworthy of a Barrister and that he should be disbarred and his name removed from the books of the Inn. And at the same Bench Table It was further Ordered That at the Parliament to be holden on Friday the 30th day of April 1909 the said Shyamaji Krishnavarma be disbarred and his name removed from the books of the Society and that this order be communicated to the Judges of the Supreme Court of Judicature, to the other Inns of Court, to the General Council of the Bar and by registered letter to the said Shyamaji Krishnavarma and be screened in the Hall. It is at this Parliament Ordered—That the said Order be and the same is hereby confirmed and the said Shyamaji Krishnavarma is hereby disbarred and his name removed from the books of the Society.—WALTER G. WRANGHAM, Sub-Treasurer."

The proposal in the Budget to substitute five years for one year for the period within which property alienated from an estate by voluntary dispositions *inter vivos* shall remain liable to duty is, says the *Times*, retrospective in the sense that it is proposed to apply it in all cases of death that occur after the introduction of the Budget.

Mr. Wade has, says the Sydney correspondent of the *Times*, caused a sensation here by withdrawing the Crown briefs from a leading barrister who attacked the Government for persuading Sir F. Darley to take a year's leave instead of resigning immediately after his retirement from the Chief Justiceship. The *Sydney Telegraph* considers that the withdrawal of Crown patronage on account of a deliverance of political opinion makes a dangerous precedent. The whole question of Sir F. Darley's retirement is likely to be made a matter for a serious attack on the Ministry directly the Legislature meets.

Court Papers.

Supreme Court of Judicature.

ROTA OF REGISTRARS IN ATTENDANCE ON				
Date.	EMERGENCY ROTA.	APPEAL COURT No. 2.	Mr. Justice JOYCE.	Mr. Justice SWINFEN EADY.
Monday ... May 10	Mr. Goldschmidt	Mr. Gresswell	Mr. Church	Mr. Beal
Tuesday ... 11	Synges	Goldschmidt	Theod	Gresswell
Wednesday ... 12	Church	Synges	Bloxam	Goldschmidt
Thursday ... 13	Theod	Church	Farmer	Synges
Friday ... 14	Bloxam	Theod	Leach	Church
Saturday ... 15	Farmer	Bloxam	Borror	Theod
Date.	Mr. Justice WASHINGTON.	Mr. Justice NAVILLE.	Mr. Justice PARKER.	Mr. Justice EVA.
Monday ... May 10	Mr. Farmer	Mr. Synges	Mr. Bloxam	Mr. Borror
Tuesday ... 11	Leach	Church	Farmer	Beal
Wednesday ... 12	Borror	Theod	Beal	Gresswell
Thursday ... 13	Beal	Bloxam	Borror	Goldschmidt
Friday ... 14	Gresswell	Farmer	Beal	Synges
Saturday ... 15	Goldschmidt	Leach	Gresswell	Church

The Property Mart.

Forthcoming Auction Sales.

May 10.—Messrs. S. H. DAVIES & Co., at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Property and Residence (see advertisement, back page, April 24).
 May 11.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, RICHARDSON & Co., at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Building Site (see advertisement, back page, April 24).
 May 12.—Messrs. EDWIN FOX & BOVEFIELD, at the Mart, at 2: Shares (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 May 12.—Messrs. TALLPOPE, at the Mart, at 2: Town Mansion and Freehold Estate (see advertisement, back page, April 24).
 May 17.—Messrs. WEATHERALL & GREEN, at the Mart, at 2: Factory, Lease of House, Residence, &c. (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 May 18.—Messrs. DAVID BURRITT, SON, & BARNESLEY, at the Mart: Freehold and Leasehold properties, Land, &c. (see advertisement, p. iii, May 1).
 May 20.—Messrs. RILCART, at the Mart, at 1: Freehold Ground-Rents (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 May 20.—Messrs. DEBENHAM, TEWSON, & Co., at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Factory (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 May 27.—Messrs. HEBBING, SON, & DAW, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Premises, Ground-Rents, Investments, &c. (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 June 9 and 11.—Mr. JOSEPH STOWERS, at the Mart, at 2: Freehold Estates (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 June 17.—Messrs. DAVID J. CHATTELL & SONS, at the Mart, at 2: Residence (see advertisement, back page, this week).
 Messrs. B. WALKER & SON, at the Mart: Freehold Ground-Rents and Properties (see advertisement, back page, March 13) at early date.

Result of Sale.

REVERSIONS, LIFE POLICIES, AND LIFE INTERESTS.
 Messrs. H. E. FOSTER & CRAWFORD held their usual Fortnightly Sale (No. 983) of the above-named interests, at the Mart, Tokenhouse-yard, E.C., on Thursday last, when the following Lots were sold at the prices named, the total amount realized being £9,105:—

ABSOLUTE REVERSIONS—	
To £3,453	...
To £1,143	...
To £1,131 12s.	...
To £1,100	...
POLICIES OF ASSURANCE for £500	...
ENDOWMENT POLICY for £2,000	...
FULLY-PAID POLICY for £400	...
LIFE INTEREST in £233 per annum	...
REVERSION to £286	...
	Sold £9,100
	£250
	£705
	£200
	£235
	£155
	£840
	£250
	£170

Winding-up Notices.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 30.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

ASCANUM TEMPERANCE SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to E. Morton Nance, 47, Victoria st., Westminster, liquidator.
 ASHFORD & CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 1, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to James Chaloner Gardner, 24, Coleman st., liquidator.
 AUTOMATIC ENGINEERING WORKS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 29, directed to be heard on May 11. Field & Co, Lincoln's inn fields, for Piment & Co, Birmingham, solrs for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.
 AUTOMATIC KNITTING MACHINES CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 27, directed to be heard on May 11. Sheard & Co, Clement's inn, Strand, for Marshall, Halifax, solr for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.

CUNNINGHAM AND DE FOURIER CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 27, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to A. J. East, 21, West India Dock rd, Sturton & Sturton, Gt Tower st, solrs for liquidator.

H. R. JOHNS WILSON & CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 17, directed to be heard at the Court House, Government bldg, Victoria st, Liverpool, on May 14, at 10. Dean & Son, Liverpool, for Darant, Guildhall chambers, solr for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach Dean & Son not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 13.

HARTLEY & CO (HAYWOOD), LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 28, directed to be heard at County Court House, Mawdale st, Bolton, on May 12, at 10. Farrar & Co, Manchester, petnrs' solrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 11.

IRRAWAT SHANING INDR AND SEAT TUNES, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 27, directed to be heard on May 11. Burton & Co, Surrey st, solrs for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.

KROONH BITESS (1906), LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 26, directed to be heard on May 11. Wild & Collins, St Lawrence's House, Trump st, Cheshire. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.

MERRY TRADING CO, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 24, directed to be heard at the Court House, Government bldg, Victoria st, Liverpool, on May 31, at 10. Thompson & McMassey, Liverpool, for Henderson & Hallmark, Llandudno, solrs for petnrs' creditors. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 30.

NAVYBERG PALUX COPPER MINES AND WORKS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 23, directed to be heard on May 11. McKenna & Co, Basinghall st, solrs for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.

NEW GOLD FARM SYNDICATE, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before May 15, to send in their names and addresses, with particulars of their debts or claims, to Maurice Jenks, liquidator.

NORTH OF ENGLAND TRADING CO, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 21, to send in their names and addresses, and particulars of such debts and claims, to Richard Hyland Daly & Fenwick st, Liverpool, liquidator.

OSONISATION SYNDICATE, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 20, directed to be heard on May 11. Carter & Bell, Idol ln, Matchamp, solrs for petnrs. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 10.

PURE ENAMEL BATH CO, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before June 2, to send in their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to H. Crawford Howard, Basinghall 70a, Basinghall st, liquidator.

SUTHERLAND AND CAITHNESS HAND-MADE CARPETS ASSOCIATION, LIMITED (IN VOLUNTARY LIQUIDATION)—Creditors must give notice of claim on or before May 13 to H. Chas. Brown, 28, Budge row, liquidator.

London Gazette.—TUESDAY, May 4.

JOINT STOCK COMPANIES.

LIMITED IN CHANCERY.

PRESTON MINES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before June 16, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Grosvenor George Walker, 19, St. Swithin's-lane, liquidator.

R. CRAIG & SONS, LIMITED—Petn for winding up, presented April 29, directed to be heard May 18. Crump & Co, Old Queen st, Westminster, for Archer & Co, Stockton-on-Tees. Notice of appearing must reach the above-named not later than 6 o'clock in the afternoon of May 17.

SIMMONDS & CO, LIMITED (IN LIQUIDATION)—Creditors are required, on or before June 1, to send their names and addresses, together with particulars of their claims, to Isaac E. Mannington, 4, Havelock-road, Hastings, liquidator.

SLOGGERS ENGINEERING WORKS, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 24, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Charles John Geoffrey Palmour, 32, Old Jewry. Styer, Fenchurch st, solr for the liquidator.

WARRAY EXTENDED GOLD MINES, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 12, to send particulars of their debts or claims, to H. Grant, Worcester House, Walbrook, liquidator.

W. LOVATT, LIMITED—Creditors are required, on or before May 31, to send their names and addresses, and the particulars of their debts or claims, to Septimus Station, 64, Fountain st, Manchester, liquidator.

Creditors' Notices.

Under 22 & 23 Vict. cap. 35.

LAST DAY OF CLAIM.

London Gazette.—FRIDAY, April 30.

ANKELL, HENRY, Croydon, Corn Dealer May 30 Hogan & Hughes, Arthur at West, London Bridge

BADHAM, GEORGE, Salter's Hall ct, Cannon st, Solicitor June 1 Badham & Co, Salter's Hall ct, Cannon st

BARKER, ALFRED JAMES FREDERICK, Esqer June 30; Travers-Smith & Co, Thurgomorton av Bally, Elizabeth Anne, Cambridge ter, Hyde Park May 19 Witham & Co, Gray's Inn sq

BENNETT, BENJAMIN, Chester, Butcher May 21 Bransley, Chester

BETTELLET, WILLIAM, Longton, Staffs, Builder July 1 Allerton, Longton

BOX, FANNY, Brentford June 1 Ruston & Co, Brentford

BUTLER, ELIZA, North Warrborough, Southampton May 10 Kingston, Basingstoke

CATLEY, ROBERT WILLIAM, Filton, Somerset May 29 Nalder, Shepton Mallet

CHERRIE, JOHN, Birmingham, Painter June 1 Walthall & Pritchard, Birmingham

CLEWORTH, Rev Canon Thomas Esqer, Middleton, Lancs June 1 Brierley & Hudson

CORNINGTON, MARIA, Horncastle May 30 Walker & Co, Alford

COOPER, SUSANNA MARTHA ANNE, Bournemouth June 1 Gibb & Sons, Edinburgh

CROOK, SARAH MACHEL, Brentwood, Essex May 31 Bellard & Co, Old Cavendish st

CUTLER, WILLIAM, Burnley, Joiner May 31 Whittingham, Burnley

DAVIS, GEORGE, Twickenham May 30 Haslip, Martin's ln

DAWSON, MARY, Crickelwood June 1 Rydon, Corahill

DIGGLE, JAMES, Birtle, nr Bury, Lancs June 2 Butcher & Barlow, Bury, Lancs

DRAKE, WILLIAM EDWARD, Brighouse, Shoe Maker June 5 Barber & Jessop, Brighouse

DUP, JOHN, Walsingham, Chichester June 1 Gill & Co, Liverpool

ELLIOTT, SARAH, Newcastle on Tyne May 31 Richardson & Elder, Newcastle on Tyne

ETTY, EDWIN THOMAS, Sutton on Derwent, Yorks, Farmer June 18 Turner, York

FARMERY, WILLIAM, Hatley, Yorks, Joiner May 25 Brearley & Son, Batley

FINZEL, HARRIETT SARAH, Northam, Devon June 1 Badham & Co, Salter's Hall ct, Cannon st

FISH, SAMUEL JAMES, Darwen, Lancs, Draper May 7 Sutcliffe, Darwen

GILLES, FREDERICK GEORGE, Banbury, Chemist May 29 Bennett, Banbury

GILLIAT, ADKIN JOLLANDS, Bradford, nr Horncastle, Lincs May 20 Walker & Co, Alford

GOSWELL, FRANCES CHARLOTTE HADLEY, Beaufort st, Chelsea May 29 Robinson & Son, Lincoln's inn fields

GREEN, JAMES, Barrow in Furness, Tailor June 11 Poole & Co, Barrow in Furness

HAGNAIR, MARY ANN, Minster rd, Hampstead June 2 Harris & Co, Finsbury sq

HALL, THOMAS, Heaton, Newcastle upon Tyne, China Merchant June 1 Dickinson & Co, Newcastle upon Tyne
 HANFAT, HUGH BENJAMIN, Bromsgrove June 1 Hoopers & Co, Birmingham
 HAWDON, HENRY, Hove, Sussex June 12 Banton & Co, Norfolk st, Strand
 HAYNES-WILLIAMS, JOHN, Eastbourne May 27 Hillman & Co, Eastbourne
 HEDDER, ROSINA FRANCES, Anne st, Waterloo rd June 1 Bell, Essex st, Strand
 HOFFMAN, WILLIAM BERNARD, Romford June 1 Edwards, Coleman st
 HOLL, ANNE SOPHIA, Torquay June 30 Oswell, Essex st, Strand
 HOLMES, EFFIE MILDRED, Bingley, Yorks June 19 Weatherhead & Knowles, Bingley
 HORN, BENJAMIN, Farley, Yorks June 1 A E & H J Carr, Leeds
 HOSKATTS, JOHN, Reading May 28 Braby & Macdonald, Arundal st, Strand
 HUGHES, PAVES HENRY, Towyn, Merioneth, Estate Agent May 21 Smith & Co, Aberystwyth
 HUMPHREY, WILLIAM, Bryneclyn, nr Aberdare, Colliery Proprietor May 26 Davies & Co, Pontypridd
 JAMES, ANN MARGARET, Smethtwick, Staffs May 10 Cooksey & Co, Old Hill, Staffs
 JONES, CHARLES WILLIAM, Gwynfryn, Carmarthen June 1 Griffiths & Co, Carmarthen
 JONES, WILLIAM ANDREW, Plumley, Chester May 31 Dunkerley, Manchester
 JONES, WILLIAM HENRY, Douglas, I of M June 8 Harris, Liverpool
 JUNKINSON, JAMES, South Norwood June 24 Collins & Collins, King William st, London Bridge
 KING, HENRY, Commercial rd, Peckham May 10 Miller & Sons, St Thomas' st
 LAMB, THOMAS, Helton le Hale, Brewer May 29 Patrick & Son, Durham
 LAMPARD, MARIANNE TERESA LIVERST, Beechmont, nr Sevenoaks June 1 Tucker & Co, New ct, Lincoln's inn
 LENCH, SAMUEL, Llandudno, Bath Chair Proprietor June 1 Chainbrlain & Johnson, Llandudno
 LEVICK, GORDON HILDEBRAND, Harrington gdns, South Kensington May 27 Wansey & Co, Moorgate st
 LOGAN, JOHN, Ashdon on Mersey June 20 Diggle & Ogden, Manchester
 MAUDS, CHARLES FREDERICK, Burwash, Sussex June 12 Andrews & Bennett, Burwash
 MOYSE, JOHN, South Beddington May 27 Sandom & Co, Gracechurch st
 PARISH, EMMA, Halesowen, Worcester May 10 Cooksey & Co, Old Hill, Staffs
 PERCIVAL, ELIZABETH, Bowdon, Chester June 5 Warburton, Manchester
 PIGGINS, MARY ANN, Brighton May 31 Bowden, Manchester

PRATT, ROBERT, Surlingham, Norfolk June 1 Havers, Norwich
 PRITCHARD, SARAH, Heath Town, Wolverhampton June 1 J & L Clark, West Bromwich
 PUCKLE, STANLEY, Langton, Tonbridge Wells May 26 Dawes & Sons, Angel ct, Throgmorton st
 ROW, THOMAS, Bampton, Devon, Solicitor May 20 Row, Bampton, Devon
 ROWLINSOON, PETER, Timperley, Cheshire June 10 Nicholls & Co, Manchester
 RUSSELL, SARAH, Small Heath, Birmingham May 10 Cooksey & Co, Old Hill, Staffs
 SCHADE, ALBERT RICHARD, Putney June 1 Wetherfield & Co, Gresham bldg, Guildhall
 SCHOLFIELD, EDWARD, Sowerby Bridge, Yorks, Warehouseman May 31 Bailey, Halifax
 SCOTNEY, ELIZABETH, Scarborough June 15 Turnbull & Sons, Scarborough
 SHEPHERD, REBECCA, Banbury, Oxford June 1 Fairfax & Barfield, Banbury
 SKIFFITH, GARY, Bideford, Devon June 7 Garrard & Co, Pall Mall East
 SMITH, HARRY WALTER, Eye, Sussex, Clerk May 31 Dawes & Co, Eye
 SMITH, JULIA, Liverpool June 14 Alsop & Co, Liverpool
 SOUTHOORN, SARAH LILY GRANGER HAMILTON, Bath June 1 Adam & Co, Bath
 SWINBURN, JANE, Worthington, Cumberland June 8 Jackson, Worthington
 THOMPSON, MATTHEW, Warkworth, Northumberland, Grocer June 12 Gibson, Newcastle upon Tyne
 TINGLE, WILLIAM WALTER WILSON, Deepcar, Yorks, Blacksmith June 1 Smith & Co, Sheffield
 VAMERS, THEODOR ALBERT GEORG ERNST, Fenchurch st, Cocoa Merchant May 31 Bartrum, Old Jewry chambers
 WAGO, HUGH, Alberta, Kennington June 14 Young & Co, Ely pl, Holborn circus
 WATSON, ELIZA MARY, Crown in, Streatham June 1 Havers, Norwich
 WELDON, FRANCIS SEYMOUR, East Molesey June 5 Worthington & Co, Nicholas ln
 WENDT, OTTO CARL AUGUST, Wimbledon, Boot Manufacturer June 10 Goldberg & Co, West st, Finsbury circus
 WILKIN, JOHN, Shipley, Yorks, Railway Agent June 1 Wright & Co, Shipley
 WILLIAMS, HARRIET, Halesowen, Worcester May 10 Cooksey & Co, Old Hill, Staffs
 WINKWORTH, LOUISE GEORGINA ALICE, Upper Tooting June 8 Burne & Wykes, Lincoln's inn fields
 WOOD, WALTER JAMES, Newport, Grocer's Manager June 1 Dauncey & Sons, Newport
 WOOLRICH, SARAH, Overton on Dee, Flint May 18 Thomas, Ellesmere, Salop
 WRIGHT, FRANCES VICTORIA, Holloway May 31 Fitzgerald, Chancery ln

Bankruptcy Notices.

London Gazette.—Friday, April 30.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BENEFIT, ALFRED, Gaywood, Norfolk, Baker King's Lynn Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 BERRY, SARAH, Blackpool, Musical Artist Preston Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 BLINKHORN, EMILY EDITH, Preston, Fancy Draper Preston Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 CHAPMAN, WILLIAM, Veyran, Cornwall, Farmer Truro Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 COATES, JOHN, Thornton le Clay, Yorks, Butcher Scarborough Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 CORD, JOHN ARTHUR, Pemberton gdns, St John's Park High Court Pet March 18 Ord April 26
 COOTER, AVIS MARIA, Hove, Sussex, Tailor Brighton Pet April 3 Ord April 28
 CARRIE, EDWARD ALFRED, Llwyn Mawr, Abergele, Denbigh, Solicitor Bangor Pet April 13 Ord April 27
 CROSBY, GEORGE HANLEY, Glossop, Derby, Grocer Ashton under Lyne Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 CUL, EVAN, Treherbert, Glam, Grocer and Draper Pontypridd Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 DAVIES, JOHN RICHARD, Dowlais, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer's Assistant Merthyr Tydfil Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 DAVIS, Enoch, Mexboro', Yorks, Tailor Sheffield Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 DEANE, GEORGE TUNTON, and FREDERICK THOMAS DEANE, Lewisham, Ladies' Costumiers Greenwich Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 GELL, WILLIAM ALBERT, and GEORGE HENRY GELL, West Bridgeford, Grocers Nottingham Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 JEFFERSON, JOHN THOMAS, Bristol, Boot Manufacturer Bristol Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 JONES, JOHN GRIFFITHS, Cross Keys, Mon, Draper Newport, Mon Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 JONES, RICHARD, Llanarmon yn Vale, Denbigh, Farm Labourer Wrexham Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 KLEE, JOHN, Wood st, Walthamstow, Baker High Court Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 LEVY, LALL, Pantan st, Haymarket, Commission Agent High Court Pet April 2 Ord April 28
 NORMAN, JOHN GLOVER, Swindon, Builder Swindon Pet April 7 Ord April 27

NORTON, JAMES, High st, Poplar, Plumber High Court Pet April 6 Ord April 28
 PARK, MURRAY THOMAS, Liverpool, Confectioners' Sundriesman Liverpool Pet April 3 Ord April 27
 PORTER, OLIVER CROMWELL, Wimbledon High Court Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 SHEPHERD, FREDERICK THOMAS, Upper Norwood, Fancy Stationer Croydon Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 TREMLITT, WILLIAM ERNEST, Southwark Bridge rd, Musical Instrument Maker High Court Pet April 28 Ord April 23
 TURNER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Nottingham, Musician Nottingham Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 TURNER, EDWARD MARK, Coseley, Staffs, Glass and China Dealer Wolverhampton Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 WAIN, HENRY, Upton Manor, Essex, Baker High Court Pet April 27 Ord April 27
 WEST, GEORGE, Cheltenham, Watchmaker Cheltenham Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 WARRER, JOHN, Coxlodge Hall, Gosforth, Northumberland, Builder Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 7 Ord April 27
 WILFORD, JOSEPH HENRY, Gosport, Hants, Pork Butcher Portsmouth Pet April 26 Ord April 28
 WILLIAMS, ERNEST CHARLES, Bourne End, Woodburn, Bucks Aylesbury Pet April 28 Ord April 28
 WILLS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Lewins Mend, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Bristol Pet April 26 Ord April 26
 WILKES, JAMES, Worcester, Tailor Worcester Pet April 28 Ord April 28

FIRST MEETINGS.

BARNETT, HENRY JAMES, Latham ter, Bedford Park, Chiswick, Builder May 11 at 3 14, Bedford row
 BERRY, SARAH, Blackpool, Musical Artist May 6 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Windley st, Preston
 BLACKMORE, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Tailor May 11 at 11.30 Ruskin chambers, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 BURTON, WILLIAM, Higher Broughton, Manchester, Builder May 8 at 11 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 CORD, JOHN ARTHUR, Pemberton gdns, St John's Park May 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 COLTON, CHARLES HENRY, St Grimsby May 11 at 11.30 10, Bank st, Lincoln
 DAVIES, JOHN RICHARD, Dowlais, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer's Assistant May 12 at 12 Off Rec, County Court, Town hall, Merthyr Tydfil

DEANE, GEORGE TUNTON, and FREDERICK THOMAS DEANE, Lewisham, Ladies' Costumiers May 10 at 11.30 13, York rd, Westminster Bridge
 DEER, WILLIAM ARTHUR, Wells, Norfolk, Tailor May 8 at 12.30 Off Rec, 8, King st, Norwich
 FINCH, JOHN, Lincoln, Baker May 11 at 12 10, Bank st, Lincoln
 GLADMAN, WILLIAM, Petworth, Sussex, Smith May 13 at 10.30 Off Rec, 4, Pavilion bldg, Brighton
 GOODYEAR, CHARLES, Ryhill, Yorks, Coal Miner May 11 at 10.30 Off Rec, 7, Regent st, Barnsley
 GORDON, CHARLES, Marquis of Huntly, Orton Longueville, Hunts May 10 at 2.30 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 HARRINGTON, MAURICE PRICE, Sefton Park, Liverpool, Stockbroker's Clerk May 11 at 11 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
 HARRISON, NELSON, Ashton under Lyne, Grocer May 8 at 11.30 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
 HUNTINGTON, ROBERT, Penrith, Cumberland, Fishmonger May 10 at 11.15 34, Fisher st, Carlisle
 JAMES, MORGAN WILLIAM, Llanelly, Carmarthen, Chemist May 8 at 11.15 Off Rec, 4, Queen st, Carmarthen
 KELLY, WILLIAM, Swindon, Dairyman May 10 at 8.30 Off Rec, 38, Regent circus, Swindon
 KESSELY, JULIUS RUDOLF, Birehfields, Staffs, Foreign Merchant May 11 at 12.30 Ruskin chambers, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 KLEE, JOHN, Walthamstow, Baker May 10 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 LAMING, WILLIAM, and GEORGE LAMING, Owston Ferry, Lincs, Blacksmiths May 11 at 12.30 19, Bank st, Lincoln
 LAWRENCE, ERNEST WILLIAM, Dover, Coal Merchant May 8 at 11 Off Rec, 68a, Castle st, Canterbury
 LOCK, JOHN, West Ocker, Somerset, Miller May 11 at 1 Off Rec, City chambers, Catherine st, Salisbury
 MORSE, FERRY, Groomport, Monmouth, Licensed Victualler May 8 at 12 2, Off st, Hereford
 MARRAT, JOHN THOMAS, Rawtenstall, Lancs, Butcher May 11 at 11.30 Townhall, Rochdale
 NORTON, JAMES, High st, Poplar, Plumber May 11 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
 PARKES, WILLIAM, Small Heath, Birmingham, Pawnbroker May 12 at 11.30 Ruskin chambers, 191, Corporation st, Birmingham
 PRADON, WILLIAM HENRY, Camborne, Cornwall, Tobaccoist May 12 at 12 Off Rec, Old Miners Bank, Truro

THE LICENSERS INSURANCE CORPORATION AND GUARANTEE FUND, LIMITED.

24, MOORGATE STREET, LONDON, E.C.
 ESTABLISHED IN 1890.

EXCLUSIVE BUSINESS—LICENSED PROPERTY.

SPECIALISTS IN ALL LICENSING MATTERS.

Upwards of 650 Appeals to Quarter Sessions have been conducted under the direction and supervision of the Corporation.

Suitable Insurance Clauses for inserting in Leases or Mortgages of Licensed Property, Settled by Counsel, will be sent on application.

PLAISTOWS, HERBERT SPENCER, Kingston upon Hull, Paper Maker's Agent May 8 at 11 Off Rec, York City Bank Chambers, Lowgate, Hull.
 PUSKOVLOV, JOSEPH, Dunchurch, Warwick, Builder May 10 at 8 Off Rec, 8, High St, Coventry.
 SHERRETT, CHARLES, FARNBROOK, Arlesey, Beds, Builder May 10 at 12 Off Rec, Bridge St, Northampton.
 TRENKLE, WILLIAM, BARNST, Southwark Bridge rd, Musical Instrument Maker May 10 at 11 Bankruptcy Bldgs, Carey St.
 THOMAS, EDWARD, St Helens, Lancs, Lodging House Keeper May 10 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria St, Liverpool.
 THORPE, FREDERICK WILLIAM, Central Wroughton, nr Swindon, Tailor May 10 at 3 Off Rec, 53, Regent Circus, Swindon.
 WARE, HENRY, Updon Manor, Essex, Baker May 10 at 12 Bankruptcy Bldgs, Carey St.
 WALKER, ERNEST EDWARD, Kingston upon Hull, Paper Merchant May 8 at 11.45 Off Rec, York City Bank Chambers, Lowgate, Hull.
 WESTWOOD, JOHN, Quarry Bank, Staffs, Grocer May 10 at 12 Off Rec, 199, Wolverhampton St, Dudley.
 WHITTIER, WILLIAM, Clayton, Lancs, Leather Carrier May 8 at 10.30 Off Rec, Byrom St, Manchester.
 WILFORD, JOSEPH HENRY, Gosport, Hants, Pork Butcher May 10 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junction, High St, Portsmouth.

ADJUDICATIONS.

BENNETT, ALFRED, Graywood, Norfolk, Baker King's Lynn Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 BERRY, SARAH, Blackpool, Musical Artists Preston Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 BILKESON, EMILY EDITH, Preston, Lancs, Fancy Draper Preston Pet April 28 Ord April 23.
 BROWN, WILLIAM CHARLES, Chiswick, Provision Dealer Edmonton Pet Mar 30 Ord April 26.
 CHAMBERS, WILLIAM VALENTINE, Hoxton St, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Mar 18 Ord April 28.
 CHAPMAN, WILLIAM, Veysey, Cornwall, Farmer Truro Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 COATES, JOHN, Thornton le Clay, Yorks, Butcher Scarborough Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 CROSSLAND, GEORGE HANMER, West Glossop, Derby, Grocer Ashton under Lyne Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 CULLE, EVAN, Treherbert, Glam, Grocer Pontypridd Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 DAVIES, JOHN RICHARD, Dowlais, Merthyr Tydfil, Grocer's Assistant Merthyr Tydfil Pet April 26 Ord April 26.
 DAVIS, BROOK, Hall Gate, Mechro', Yorks, Tailor Sheffield Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 DEANE, GEORGE TUSTON, and FREDERICK THOMAS DEANE, High St, Lewisham, Ladies' Costumiers Greenwich Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 DENNIS, WILLIAM HERBERT, Liverpool, Surgeon Dentist High Court Pet Feb 5 Ord April 26.
 FITZGERALD, DORA MABEL, Fulham Palace rd, Putney Bridge High Court Pet Mar 25 Ord April 26.
 FORSTER, JOHN MARKS, Leeds, Furniture Dealer Leeds Pet Mar 31 Ord April 27.

FARMERMAN, LOUIS GERALD, Marylebone rd, Motor Agent High Court Pet Feb 11 Ord April 26.
 GILL, WILLIAM ALBERT, and GEORGE HENRY GILL, West Bridgeford, Notts, Grocers Nottingham Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 GIBSON, JAMES, Knott Mill, Manchester Manchester Pet Jan 22 Ord April 26.
 GURZOW, ROBERT CARL FRIEDRICH THEODORE, Upton, Bexley Heath, Florist High Court Pet Feb 20 Ord April 28.
 LOIRNS, FRANK CLARKSON, Charlton Kings, Cheltenham, Merchant Cheltenham Pet Mar 18 Ord April 26.
 JONES, JOHN GRIFFITH, Cross Keys, Mon, Draper Newport Mon Pet April 23 Ord April 26.
 JONES, RICHARD, Llanarmon yn Vale, Denbigh, Farm Labourer Wrexham Pet April 23 Ord April 23.
 KLEE, JOHN, Walthamstow, Essex, Baker High Court Pet April 26 Ord April 26.
 MILLER, EDWARD, St Mark's rd, Kennington Park, Carman High Court Pet Mar 8 Ord April 24.
 NORMAN, JOHN GLOVER, Swindon, Builder Swindon Pet April 7 Ord April 28.
 PORTER, OLIVER CADWELL, Wimbledon High Court Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 SEAMAN, WILLIAM, South Norwood, Builder Croydon Pet Mar 16 Ord April 27.
 SHEPHERD, FREDERICK THOMAS, Upper Norwood, Fancy Stationer Croydon Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 SLACK, NEVIL COURTNEY, Wantage, Berks, (Licensed Victualler Oxford Pet Mar 9 Ord April 26).
 TEMCATT, WILLIAM ERNEST, Southwark Bridge rd, Musical Instrument Maker High Court Pet April 28 Ord April 28.
 TURNER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Nottingham, Musician Nottingham Pet April 26 Pet April 26.
 TURNER, EDWARD MARK, Hurst Hill, Coseley, Staffs, Glass Dealer Wolverhampton Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 WAHN, HENRY, Upton Manor, Essex, Baker High Court Pet April 27 Ord April 27.
 WEST, GEORGE, Cheltenham, Watchmaker Cheltenham Pet April 26 Ord April 26.

ADJUDICATIONS ANNULLED.

PARK, SARAH, Sheringham, Norfolk Norwich Adjud Mar 16 Annul April 28.
 WOOLLEY, JOHN ALFRED, Old Radford, Nottingham, Miller Nottingham Adjud Nov 17, 1899 Annul April 23, 1903.

London Gazette.—Tuesday, April 4.

RECEIVING ORDERS.

BLISS, RICHARD, Weedon, Northampton, Carter Northampton Pet May 3 Ord May 3.
 BASTARD, THOMAS, Church End, Finchley, Builder Barnet Pet Mar 23 Ord April 29.
 BICKLEY, SAMUEL WILLIAM, Weston super Mare, Somerset Bridgwater Pet April 17 Ord April 30.
 CLACHER, WILLIAM, Tudstall, Boreseller Hanley Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 ELLIOTT, ARTHUR, HARRY NUTTALL, and THOMAS SPENCER BUTTERWORTH, Rochdale, Chip Potato Range Makers Rochdale Pet April 26 Ord April 29.

CLARKE, RICHARD GARNER, Belvedere, Kent, Assistant Schoolmaster Rochester Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 COLE, RALPH, West Hartlepool, Fisherman Sunderland Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 DAVIES, LEWIS JOHN, Ystrad, Rhondda, Glam, Cycle Repairer Portmadoc Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 DOWNEY, ROBERT, Southsea, Hants, Tailor Portsmouth Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 EGGEN, FREDERICK, St James St, Finsbury High Court Pet April 1 Ord April 30.
 FINNEY, ARTHUR BENJAMIN, Small Heath, Birmingham, Foreman Birmingham Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 FORWOOD, RICHARD THOMAS, River Dover, Kent, Millman Canterbury Pet April 28 Ord April 29.
 GIBSON, FRANCESCA GRAYNE, Wimbledon Common Kingston, Surrey Pet Jan 7 Ord April 29.
 GOLSBY, WILLIAM ALFRED, Liverpool, Boot Dealer Liverpool Pet April 18 Ord April 29.
 GRIFFITHS, SAMUEL ROBERTS, Elmstone, Salop, Plumber Wrexham Pet April 29 Ord April 29.
 HEWLAND, CHARLES, Kingston upon Hull, Butcher Kingston upon Hull Pet April 29 Ord April 29.
 HILL, FREDERICK, Leicester, Pianoforte Tuner Leicester Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 HILLS, ALBERT EDWARD, Hastings, Plumber Hastings Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 HOWELLS, JOHN, Caerlau, nr Bridgend, Glam, Collier Cardiff Pet April 29 Ord April 29.
 HUNTER, JOHN EDWARD, Ambleside, Westmorland Fish-monger Kendal Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 ISAAC, WILLIAM GEORGE, Crediton, Insurance Agent Exeter Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 JAMES, JOHN, Kingsbury Episcopi, Somerset, Grocer Yeovil Pet April 29 Ord April 29.
 KRAPTON, GEORGE, Rhoslanerchrugog, Denbigh, Physician Wrexham Pet April 29 Ord April 29.
 LEWIS, WILLIAM, Brithdir, Glam, Contractor Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 MITCHEM, JESSE WILLIAM, Dorchester, Blacksmith Dorchester Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 NEWTON, WILLIAM EDWIN, Stapenhill, Derby, Joiner Burton on Trent Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 NOBLE, JAMES, Liverpool, Grocer Liverpool Pet April 24 Ord April 29.
 PARRY, ROBERT, Caernarvon, Bodedern Valley, Anglesey, Farmer Bognor Pet April 15 Ord April 30.
 PLAYLE, BERTIE LEONARD, Brandon, Suffolk, Tailor and Outfitter Norwich Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 PRITCHARD, HERBERT WILLIAM, Wolverhampton, Baker Wolverhampton Pet April 30 Ord April 30.
 PYMAN, CHARLES ARTHUR, Langmere with Dickleburgh, Norfolk, Farmer Ipswich Pet April 15 Ord April 30.
 QUARTERMAN, JOSEPH, Pontefract, Auctioneer Wakefield Pet April 20 Ord April 30.
 RIVOLTA, JOHN ROWLANDS ANTONIO, Strand, Ryde, I of W Newport Pet May 1 Ord May 1.
 ROSE, ALFRED GEORGE, Norwood rd, West Norwood, Builder High Court Pet April 2 Ord April 29.
 TURNER, GEORGE THOMAS, Shepherd's Bush, Tyre Manufacturer High Court Pet April 8 Ord April 29.

LAW FIRE INSURANCE SOCIETY LTD.,

No. 114, Chancery Lane,

London, W.C.



DIRECTORS—

Sir RICHARD NICHOLSON, Chairman (Nicholson, Patterson, & Freeland).
 CHARLES P. JOHNSON, Esq., Vice-Chairman (Johnsons, Long, & Raymond-Barker).

GEORGE WILLIAM BELL, Esq.
 H. D. BEWES, Esq. (Bewes & Dickinson).
 L. C. CHOLMELEY, Esq. (Frere, Cholmeley, & Co.).
 E. F. B. CHURCH, Esq. (Church, Adams, & Prior).
 F. E. E. FAREBROTHER, Esq. (Fadgate & Co.).
 Sir WILLIAM JAMES FARRER (formerly of Farrer & Co.).
 C. W. GHANAM, Esq. (Lawrence, Graham, & Co.).
 W. A. T. HALLOWES, Esq. (Hallowes, Carter, & Ellis).
 EDWIN HART, Esq. (Budd, Brodie, & Hart).
 E. CARLETON HOLMES, Esq. (E. Carleton Holmes, Son, & Fell).
 F. R. JAMES, Esq. (Gwynne James & Son).
 HARRY W. LEE, Esq. (Lee, Bolton, & Lee).
 DILLON R. L. LOWE, Esq. (Lowe & Co.).
 FREDERICK MORGAN, Esq., J.P. (Saxton & Morgan).

SOLICITOR—W. S. HARRISON (C. & S. Harrison & Co.).

SECRETARY—H. T. OWEN LEGGATT.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY—ARTHUR E. C. WHITE.

This Society consequent on its close connection with, and exceptional experience of the requirements of, the Legal Profession is able to offer special facilities to Solicitors for the transaction of Fire Insurance business on the most favourable terms, whilst it enjoys the highest reputation for prompt and liberal settlement of claims.

Prospectuses and Proposal Forms may be had on application.

The business of the Society is confined to the United Kingdom.

VEITCH, WILLIAM CUTHBERT, Shildon, Durham, Pharmaceutical Chemist Durham Pet April 30 Ord April 30
WILLS, GEORGE SAMPOSON VALENTINE, Clapham rd, Professor of Chemistry Wandsworth Pet April 2 Ord April 29
WITT, EDWARD, York, Provision Merchant York Pet April 30 Ord April 30

FIRST MEETINGS.

BLINKHORN, EMILY EDITH, Preston, Lancs, Fancy Draper May 12 at 11.30 Off Rec, 13, Winkley st, Preston
CAMPION, ALFRED ERNEST, Burnley, Painter May 12 at 11 Off Rec, 13, Winkley st, Preston
CLARKE, RICHARD GARNER, Belvedere, Kent, Assistant Schoolmaster May 17 at 2 115, High st, Rochester
COATES, JOHN THOMSON le Clay, Yorks, Butcher May 12 at 4 Off Rec, 45, Westborough, Scarborough
COOPER, AVIS MARIA, Hove, Sussex, Tailor May 12 at 12 Off Rec, Bankruptcy bldg (Room 33), Carey st
CROSSLY, GEORGE HANER, Glossop, Derby, Grocer May 12 at 3 Off Rec, Byrom st, Manchester
DOWNEY, ROBERT, Southsea, Hants, Tailor May 12 at 3 Off Rec, Cambridge junction, High st, Portsmouth
EGBRA, FREDERICK, 8t James st, Financier May 14 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
FAIRHEAD & Co, Twickenham, Billiard Table Makers May 12 at 12 14, Bedford row
GIBSON, FRANCIS GARNER, Wimbledon Common May 12 at 12 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
GOLST, WILLIAM ALFRED, Liverpool, Boot Dealer May 12 at 2.30 Off Rec, 35, Victoria st, Liverpool
HEWLAND, CHARLES, Kingston upon Hull, Butcher May 12 at 11 Off Rec, York City, Bank chmbrs, Lowgate, Hull
JONES, RICHARD, Llanarmonnyale, Denbigh, Farm Labourer May 12 at 12 Crypt chmbrs, Eastgate row, Chester
LEVY, LAILL, Panton st, Haymarket, Commission Agent May 12 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
MITCHELL, JAMES WILLIAM, Winterborne Abbas, Dorset, Blacksmith May 13 at 1 Off Rec, City chmbrs, Catherine st, Salisbury
PORTER, OLIVER CROSSLAND, Wimbledon May 13 at 11 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
ROSE, ALFRED GEORGE, Norwood rd, West Norwood, Builder May 12 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
SABBERT, ALFRED, Wellingborough, Northampton, Commercial Traveller May 14 at 11 Off Rec, Bridge st, Northampton
SLACK, NEVIL COUNTRY, Wantage, Berks, Licensed Victualler May 12 at 12 1 St Aldates, Oxford
SHEPHERD, FREDERICK THOMAS, Upper Norwood, Fancy Stationer May 12 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
THOMPSON, EDWARD JOSEPH, Sandwich, Baker May 12 at 10.30 Off Rec, 63A, Castle st, Canterbury
TURNER, ARTHUR WILLIAM, Nottingham, Musician May 12 at 11 Off Rec, 4, Castle pl, Park st, Nottingham
TURNER, GEORGE THOMAS, Westville rd, Shepherd's Bush Tyre Manufacturer May 13 at 12 Bankruptcy bldg, Carey st
WEST, GEORGE, Cheltenham, Watchmaker May 13 at 3.15 County Court bldg, Cheltenham
WHARRIE, JOHN, Gosforth, Northumberland, Builder May 12 at 12 Off Rec, 30, Mosley st, Newcastle on Tyne
WILKS, JAMES, Worcester, Tailor May 14 at 3 Off Rec, 11, Copenhagen st, Worcester
WILLS, GEORGE SAMPOSON VALENTINE, Clapham rd, Professor of Chemistry May 13 at 11.30 132, York rd, Westminster Bridge
WILLS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Lwms Mead, Bristol Licensed Victualler May 12 at 11.30 Off Rec, 26, Baldwin st, Bristol
WITT, EDWARD, York, Provision Merchant May 17 at 3 Off Rec, The Red House, Duncombe pl, York

ADJUDICATIONS.

BESS, CHARLES HENRY, Birmingham, Auctioneer Birmingham Pet April 6 Ord April 30
BLACKMORE, WILLIAM, Birmingham, Tailor Birmingham Pet April 14 Ord April 30
BLISS, RICHARD, Weedon, Northampton, Carter Northampton Pet May 3 Ord May 3
CLACHER, WILLIAM, Tunstall, Beerseller Hanley Pet May 1 Ord May 1
CLARKE, RICHARD GARNER, Belvedere, Kent, Assistant Schoolmaster Rochester Pet April 30 Ord April 30
COLE, RALPH, West Hartlepool, Fisherman Sunderland Pet April 30 Ord April 30
DAVIES, LEWIS JOHN, Ystrad, Rhondda, Glam, Cycle Repairer Portsmouth Pet May 1 Ord May 1
DOWNEY, ROBERT, Southsea, Hants, Tailor Portsmouth Pet April 30 Ord April 30
FORWOOD, RICHARD THOMAS, River, Dover, Milkman Canterbury Pet April 29 Ord April 29
GRIFFITHS, SAMUEL ROBERTS, Eillemere, Salop, Plumber Wrexham Pet April 29 Ord April 29
HARRISON, NELSON, Ashton upon Lyne, Grocer Ashton under Lyne Pet May 14 Ord April 29
HEWLAND, CHARLES, Kingston upon Hull, Butcher Kingston upon Hull Pet April 29 Ord April 29

ILL, FREDERICK, Leicester, Pianoforte Tuner Leicester Pet May 1 Ord May 1
HILLS, ALBERT EDWARD, Hastings, Plumber Hastings Pet April 30 Ord April 30
HOWALLA, JOHN, Caerau, nr Bridgend, Collier Cardiff Pet April 29 Ord April 29
HURTER, JOHN EDWARD, Nook, Ambleside, Westmorland, Fishmonger Kendal Pet April 30 Ord April 30
ISAAC, WILLIAM GEORGE, Crediton, Devon, Insurance Agent Exeter Pet April 30 Ord April 30
JEAMES, JOHN, Kinsbury Episcopi, Somerset, Grocer Yeovil Pet April 29 Ord April 29
KNAPTON, GEORGE, Rhoslanerchrugog, Denbigh, Physician Wrexham Pet April 29 Ord April 29
LEWNEY, SAMUEL, Titchfield, Hants, Baker Portsmouth Pet April 15 Ord April 29
LEWIS, WILLIAM, Brithdir, Glam, Contractor Merthyr Tydfil Pet May 1 Ord May 1
MCARDY, JAMES, Beaumont crescent, West Kensington High Court Pet Dec 30 Ord April 29
MANDERVILLE, HENRY MORTON, Laurie Park rd, Sydenham High Court Pet Mar 27 Ord April 29
MITCHELL, JAMES WILLIAM, Dorchester, Dorset, Blacksmith Dorchester Pet April 30 Ord April 30
NEWTON, WILLIAM EDWIN, Stapenhill, Joiner Burton on Trent Pet April 30 Ord April 30
NOBLE, JAMES, Liverpool, Grocer Liverpool Pet April 24 Ord April 30
PARK, MORRIS THOMAS, Liverpool, Confectioners' Sundries Liverpool Pet April 3 Ord April 30
PLAYNE, BERTIE LEONARD, Brandon, Suffolk, Tailor Norwich Pet May 1 Ord May 1
PRITCHARD, HERBERT WILLIAM, Wolverhampton, Baker Wolverhampton Pet April 30 Ord April 30
RIVOLTA, JOHN ROWLANDS ANTONIO, Ryde, I of W Newport Pet May 1 Ord May 1
SABBERT, ALFRED, Wellingborough, Northampton, Commercial Traveller Northampton Pet Mar 9 Ord April 29
STUBBS, JOHN EDWARD CHARLES, Blackfriars rd, Licensed Victualler High Court Pet Mar 11 Ord April 30
VEITCH, WILLIAM CUTHBERT, Shildon, Durham, Pharmaceutical Chemist Durham Pet April 30 Ord April 30
WHARRIE, JOHN, Gosforth, Northumberland, Builder Newcastle on Tyne Pet April 7 Ord April 30
WHITE, JAMES, Rochdale, Estate Agent Rochdale Pet Mar 9 Ord May 1
WILFORD, JOSEPH HENRY, Gosport, Hants, Pork Butcher Portsmouth Pet May 29 Ord April 29
WILLS, WILLIAM CHARLES, Lewins Mead, Bristol, Licensed Victualler Bristol Pet April 26 Ord April 30
WITT, EDWARD, York, Provision Merchant York Pet April 30 Ord April 30

SOLICITOR (24), Public School Man, articulated Birmingham and London, First Class Intermediate, Second Final, experience chiefly Conveyancing, Trusts, Common Law and Chancery, now with Magistrate's Clerk, desires Managing Clerkship, town or country; salary £100 to £150.—Apply, Box 376, "Solicitors' Journal and Weekly Reporter," 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

SOLICITOR (admitted), Honours, 1908, desires Managing Clerkship with view to partnership (small connection); town or country; experienced Conveyancing, Chancery and Common Law. Company and Commercial, County Court; excellent references.—Address, Box 553, Willings, 125, Strand, W.C.

JUNIOR CLERK (22) seeks situation in country office. Knowledge of Abstracting, simple Conveyancing, Shorthand, Typewriting, Engraving, and General Practice; seven years' references; moderate salary.—SPERO, 11, West Croft, Bideford.

ARTICLED PUPIL required by well-known firm of North London Auctioneers and Surveyors, holders of both Institutions; thorough tuition in all branches of the profession; small premium returnable in salary.—Apply, AUCROSS, Box 645, "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

TO SOLICITORS.—Thousands of pounds lost annually by non-delivery or delivery of insufficient Bills of Costs; can be remedied by employing expert of many years' experience, town and country; moderate fee.—Address, "READY," "Solicitors' Journal" Office, 27, Chancery-lane, W.C.

CITY OFFICES TO BE LET.—Four rooms, close to Rothschild's Bank and overlooking the garden of Sakers' Hall; well lighted and conveniently arranged; suit Solicitors, Accountants, Insurance Brokers, or other professional firm; occupation Midsummer; rent £350.—Apply to the Agents, Messrs. GREEN & SON, 17, St. Swithin's-lane, E.C.

THE NORTHERN ASSURANCE COMPANY LIMITED.

Established 1886.

London: 1, Moorgate Street.
Aberdeen: 1, Union Terrace.
Accumulated Funds, £7,186,864.
The SEVENTY-THIRD ANNUAL GENERAL MEETING of this Company was held within their house at Aberdeen on Wednesday, the 5th May, 1909, when the Directors' Report was presented.

The following is a summary of the report referred to:—
FIRE DEPARTMENT.

The PREMIUMS received last year amounted to £1,229,247, showing a decrease of £29,221 in comparison with those of previous year.

The LOSSES amount to £704,234, or 57.3 per cent. of the premiums.

The EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT (including commission to agents and charges of every kind) came to £452,578, or 36.8 per cent. of the premiums.

LIFE DEPARTMENT.

ASSURANCE BRANCHES.—During the year 1,229 Policies were issued for new assurances, amounting in the aggregate to the sum of £482,919. These new assurances yielded annual premiums amounting to £15,776, and single premiums amounting to £2,200.

The TOTAL INCOME of the year from premiums was £283,596, and from interest £140,588.

The CLAIMS amounted to £318,024.

The EXPENSES OF MANAGEMENT (including commission) were limited, in the Life Accounts to 10 per cent., and in the Endowment Account to 5 per cent., of the premiums received.

ANNUITY BRANCH.—The sum of £59,109 was received for annuities granted during the year.

The whole FUNDS of the Life Department now amount to £4,891,015.

ACCIDENT DEPARTMENT.

The PREMIUMS received last year were £26,499 in the Employers' Liability Section, and £5,593 in the General Section.

The report having been unanimously adopted, it was resolved that the total amount to be distributed among the Shareholders for the year 1908 be £112,500 (being dividend of 6s. and bonus of 1s. per share), in addition to £7,500 the instalment of 6d. per share now due of the Shareholders' Life Bonus 1906-10.

LONDON BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

Colonel Robert Baring, Esq.	Frederick Huth Jackson, Esq.
H. CONRO O. Bonsor, Esq.	Henry James Lubbock, Esq.
Lawrence E. Chalmers, Esq.	Charles James Lucas, Esq.
Ernest Chaplin, Esq.	Rt. Hon. Viscount Milner, G.C.B., G.C.M.G.
Alex. H. van Gosen, Esq.	Rt. Hon. Sir Algernon West, G.C.B.
Henry Charles Hambro, Esq.	
Wm. Egerton Hubbard, Esq.	

SECRETARY.—H. Gayford.

FIRE DEPARTMENT. J. Robertson, Home Superintendent.

LIFE DEPARTMENT. H. Foot, Actuary.

ACCIDENT DEPARTMENT. W. E. Tremen, Superintendent.

GENERAL MANAGERS OF THE COMPANY.—H. E. Wilson.

Copies of the report, with the whole accounts of the Company for the year 1908, may be obtained from any of the Company's offices or agents.

FREEHOLD and LEASEHOLD HOUSES, SHOPS, ESTATES, GROUND-RENTS, FARMS, BUILDING LAND, &c., WANTED.

NO SALE, NO CHARGE OF ANY KIND.
C. HAMILTON, 33, Tower-chambers, Moorgate-street, London, E.C.

MORTGAGES OF ANY AMOUNT

Promptly ARRANGED—
Interest 3½ to 4½ per Cent. per Annum—
On HOUSES, SHOPS, ESTATES, REVERSIONS, ANNUITIES, &c.
NO PRELIMINARY FEES—NO ADVANCE, NO CHARGE.
C. HAMILTON, 33, Tower-chambers, Moorgate-street, London, E.C.

FREEHOLD BUILDING LAND FOR SALE.

Over 150 acres, West Middlesex, near London. Only £400 per acre. NO RESTRICTIONS WHATSOEVER. Some villas built. Gentlemen's residences adjacent.
C. HAMILTON, 33, Tower-chambers, Moorgate-street, London, E.C.

SHARE OF OFFICE.—Architect (A.R.I.B.A. by exam.) seeks a Gentleman to Share his Furnished Office, in sight of Bank of England; would suit young professional man starting in practice; inclusive terms, £15 per annum.—ARCHITECT, Messrs. Standidge & Co, Old Jewry, E.C.

BRAND'S MEAT JUICE FOR INVALIDS.

Prepared from the Finest Meat only.
In Flasks, price 2/6.

SOLD EVERYWHERE.
BRAND & CO., Limited, MAYFAIR, W.

HOLIDAY SEASON.
ACCIDENTS of all kinds,
SICKNESS, EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY,
BURGLARY AND FIDELITY GUARANTEE RISKS
INSURED AGAINST BY THE
RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE CO.,
Capital (fully subscribed) £1,000,000. Claims paid £5,600,000.
64, CORNHILL, LONDON. A. VIAN, Secretary.